1	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
2	MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
3	
4	
5	
6	OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT
7	PUBLIC HEARING TELECONFERENCE
8	COOK INLET SALE 149
9	
10	
11	
	Minerals Management Service
12	6th Floor Conference Room 949 East 36th Avenue
13	Anchorage, Alaska 99503
14	
15	Friday, March 3, 1995 11:00 o'clock a.m.
16	
17	
18	
19	MMS PANEL MEMBERS
20	Ms. Judith Gottlieb
21	Regional Director, Alaska Region of MMS Mr. Barry Boudreau
22	Regional Supervisor for Field Operations Dr. Ray Emerson
23	DEIS Project Leader, Leasing and Environment Office
24	
25	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording. Transcript produced by transcription service.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

#### 1 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA - FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1995 2 3 (On record at 11:00 a.m.) 4 RECEPTIONIST: Port Graham Village Council. 5 MR. NUTTALL: Good morning. This is the Minerals 6 Management Service, and we're setting up a teleconference for 7 the Sale 149 public hearings. RECEPTIONIST: Okay. Hold on just a minute. 8 9 setting up now? 10 MR. NUTTALL: Yes, we are. 11 RECEPTIONIST: Okay. Hold on. 12 (Pause - Whispered conversations) 13 RECEPTIONIST: Hello? 14 MR. NUTTALL: Hello. 15 RECEPTIONIST: Hello. 16 MR. NUTTALL: Yes. RECEPTIONIST: There's no one here available for the 17 18 teleconference. 19 MR. TREMONT: This is John Tremont. I think we've 20 spoken before. Did Ms. McMullen designate somebody to speak 21 for the village? 22 RECEPTIONIST: No, she didn't. I just talked to my 23 supervisor. She said no one's available for it. 24 MR. TREMONT: Okay. Very good then. Please be

advised that you can submit written comments.

1	RECEPTIONIST: Okay. Thank you.
2	MR. NUTTALL: Thank you very much.
3	(Teleconference disconnected)
4	MR. NUTTALL: Well, now on to Seldovia.
5	(Pause - Whispered conversation)
6	RECEPTIONIST: Good morning. City of Seldovia. This
7	is Diane.
8	MR. NUTTALL: Good morning. This is the Minerals
9	Management Service, and we're setting up a teleconference for
10	the Sale 149 public hearings.
11	RECEPTIONIST: Right.
12	MR. NUTTALL: Is Ms. Elizabeth Renz in, please?
13	RECEPTIONIST: Hang on for just a moment, okay?
14	(Pause - Whispered conversation)
15	RECEPTIONIST: Just a moment, okay?
16	MR. NUTTALL: Thank you very much.
17	RECEPTIONIST: Yes.
18	MR. NUTTALL: This is Minerals Management Service.
19	MS. RENZ: Right. This is Elizabeth Renz, City
20	Manager, City of Seldovia, and I have a Council member here,
21	Eric Nordenson. And so there are just the two of us here.
22	MR. NUTTALL: Okay. Are we coming in loud and clear
23	to you?
24	MS. RENZ: Beautifully. And who are you?
25	MR. NUTTALL: My name is Chris Nuttall. I'm handling

the phones. And I'd like to introduce our Regional Director,
Ms. Judith Gottlieb.

MS. RENZ: Okay.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Good morning. This is Judy Gottlieb, and I just wanted to -- I'll open up the public testimony. So if you'll bear with me for just a few minutes, I need to -- I would like to read some things into the record. And if you have any questions, then, on the testimony, please feel free to ask.

Are you hearing me okay?

MS. RENZ: Perfectly.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Great. Thanks, Liz.

Good morning. Welcome to the hearing on the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Federal Oil and
Gas Lease Sale 149 in Cook Inlet.

My name is Judy Gottlieb. I'm the Regional Director of the Alaska Region of the Minerals Management Service. The other panel members that I have here are Mr. Barry Boudreau, who is the Regional Supervisor for Field Operations in Anchorage, and Dr. Ray Emerson, the Project Leader for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement preparation from the Leasing and Environment Office.

You have the honor of being the first public hearing participants, and we will have one later today in Anchorage and then, as you probably know, others next week in Kenai, Homer,

and Kodiak. Port Graham we called earlier today, and they did not have any testifiers. And Nanwalek said they would not have any, so we did not call them this morning.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive the views, comments, and suggestions of interested individuals and representatives of local government and organizations on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Want to give you just a little background material.

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement covers approximately 2 million acres which are being considered for leasing, or about 37 percent of the entire planning area.

We have the responsibility to fulfill the mandates set out in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Oil Pollution Act. Also, oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammals Protection Act, Clean Water Act, Clean Air, Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and many others. In addition, the Minerals Management Service has in place regulations and operating requirements that are designed to make offshore operations safe and clean.

Discharges from the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas exploration and production activities will be subject to the Environmental Protection Agency's national pollution discharge elimination system permits. Under a local memorandum

of agreement between the Minerals Management Service and the EPA on federal platforms, we have agreed to conduct these permit compliance inspections of Outer Continental Shelf facilities in conjunction with normal drilling and production inspections.

Under this agreement, the Minerals Management Service may also collect samples of discharges and provide them to EPA for independent analyses. In federal waters, the Minerals Management Service has been conducting these kind of permit compliance inspections in Alaska since 1989, specifically during exploratory drilling operations in the Chuckchi and Beaufort Seas. We are aware that the EPA recently fined companies in the upper Cook Inlet for violation of permit conditions related to discharges that exceed permit limits, mostly for sanitary and domestic wastes, but also for oil and grease discharges.

We recently completed a water quality study in Cook Inlet which examined hydrocarbon concentrations in water, sediments, and mussels at the regional scale and found no evidence of regional hydrocarbon contamination. The MMS study did not look for contaminants related to sanitary and domestic wastes. However, the study did perform sensitive life stage bioassays which indicated no harmful levels of contaminants in general. These study results are included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The EIS represents about three years of preparation, which included such actions as the call for information, area identification, and scoping. You have been a part of this process, and through your earlier comments, and are invited once again to give us your comments. The Environmental Impact Statement is a very important element in the decision process. The law under which we operate requires that the Secretary of Interior balance national public policy goals. The law requires considerable consultation with the Governor, balancing national needs with the well-being of local citizens.

We want everyone here to understand that MMS does not take this proposal lightly and that we approach all leasing decisions very cautiously and carefully. For example, as a result of public input directly from you and others, we have deleted a majority of the Shelikof Strait portion of the planning area, which included 358 blocks and approximately 1.7 million acres, from our original proposal.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement contains mitigating measures that have, for the first time, been committed to and made part of the proposed action and the alternatives at this very early phase of the decision process, which was a suggestion made at previous public hearings here in Alaska. There are also additional potential mitigating measures proposed for analysis and that a Secretarial decision to include those additional mitigating measures will be made

б

upon approval of the notice of sale.

g

Just a few rules to go over. If you would state your name, address, organization or agency you represent. We'd like to have the information properly recorded, so I may ask you to spell it out. And if your comments could be no more than about 10 minutes, we'd appreciate that.

An official recorder is here to make the verbatim transcript of the hearing. Everything that is spoken when the hearing is in session will be recorded. Copies of the transcripts are available through Cindy and Robert Carl, who are here right now, our recorders of Executary Court Reporting Services.

The purpose of this hearing is to improve the quality of our Environmental Impact Statement before it is put in final form. We won't necessarily question you unless a member of the panel wishes to have some facts clarified or obtain additional information. We are understanding -- we are interested in understanding your views about this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Also, for your information, the comment period for this document closes April 19th. Until that time, we will accept written comments and statements from anyone who would prefer to make written rather than the oral comments. And these written comments and statements should be sent to our address. If you have any information, we have an 800 number,

800-764-2627, if you have any questions or need anything clarified after we conclude.

I also need to mention, for the benefit of the member of the public who is here this morning, that because we share this building with the Internal Revenue Service, and because they are having a problem with an irate taxpayer today, we do have several guards in the building. So just to clarify why there are guards outside our hearing room.

So with that, Liz, did you want to testify first?

MS. RENZ: Sure. I'd be glad to.

MS. RENZ: My name is Elizabeth Renz, R-e-n-z, City Manager for the City of Seldovia.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks, and go ahead then.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. ELIZABETH RENZ

In reference, the DEIS, I think it's an extraordinary piece of work. A lot of care and thought have gone into that document, and they have really worked diligently to make that into language which is comprehensible by people who are really interested in reading about the topic.

One thing in particular that has surfaced in this area is a lot of concern about the fact that activity in the Cook Inlet Region really directly impacts us, and there is some concern there about the tradeoff in benefits versus risks in terms of there do not seem to be an apparent equal amount of benefits to our area for drilling in Cook Inlet, and the risk

seems to be very high. That seems to be consensus of most of the people that I've talked to.

As far as specific individuals, we only have Eric Nordenson here that wishes to respond. But generally, the comments that have been made to me have been they would prefer not to see drilling in the Cook Inlet Region because it would put us at great risk and does not appear to have any direct benefit to our community.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate those comments. Anyone have any questions?

(No audible response)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks, Elizabeth. And we have another person to testify?

MR. NORDENSON: Yes, I'm Eric Nordenson. It's N-o-r-d-e-n-s-o-n, Seldovia, Alaska. I'm a resident and a current City Council member. I have just a little statement that I sat down and wrote about this, so I'd like to go ahead and read it if that's all right.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Sure. That would be fine.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. ERIC NORDENSON

Okay. It starts out, I am a lifelong resident of Seldovia. I was raised here as a commercial fisherman and still am doing so. The Kenai Peninsula has grown immensely since the '50s when I was a kid. Commercial fishing year around is a major contributor to the economy of the lower Cook

Inlet villages and cities.

Tourism has become a large commercial and economic factor from Anchorage to Kodiak recently, and this part of Alaska will be right at the top in the future, if it's not already. Myself and many in Seldovia oppose the sale of 149, considering the risk factors stated in the Environmental Impact Statement. Any size spill is not acceptable at all, as far as we're concerned. Tanker traffic in Cook Inlet is high now. Enlarging this traffic if oil and gas is found and produced further raises the odds for a spill.

Lower Cook Inlet should be left alone for oil and gas production. I think that a less delicate area should be found and explored.

And that's my feeling. I was born here in Seldovia, and there's still quite a few of us left around here that are lifelong residents, too, and we all pretty much feel the same. So that's really about all I have to say.

MS. GOTTLIEB: We appreciate that, Eric, and that's very thoughtful comments. That does have a higher impact from someone who has lived in a place all their lives.

MR. NORDENSON: Thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Will there be anyone else who wishes to speak from Seldovia?

MS. RENZ: No, that's it for today.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Well, we certainly appreciate

1 your participation. And again, everyone has till April 19th to 2 submit written comments, and we appreciate that you were able to make it today. 3 4 MS. RENZ: Okay. Thank you for including us. 5 MS. GOTTLIEB: Sure. 6 MR. NORDENSON: This is Eric. I had one more thing 7 to say. 8 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. 9 FURTHER PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. ERIC NORDENSON Seldovia's always been kind of a place where you 10 11 can't get people -- they'll talk a lot, but when it comes to 12 doing something like this, it's hard to get them to come forth. So Elizabeth and I both are kind of -- we're kind of relating 13 14 just about the majority opinion around here, and I'm stating 15 that quite factually, being on the City Council, especially. 16 MS. GOTTLIEB: That's right, and that's helpful for 17 us to know, too. 18 MS. RENZ: Thank you very much. 19 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Thank you both. 20 MS. RENZ: Bye. 21 MS. GOTTLIEB: Bye. 22 (Pause - Teleconference disconnected) 23 MR. NUTTALL: Okay.

Off record?

MS. GOTTLIEB: Off record then, yes.

COURT REPORTER:

24

> Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

2

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	11														_									
2	PUBLIC	TECT	TMON	īv																				
3																								PAG
4		lizab						•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	9
5		cic N	orae	ensor	1.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		10/1
6																								
7																								
8																								
9																								
10	<u>.</u>																							
11																								
12																								
13																								
14																								
15																								
16																								
17																								
18																								
19																								
20																								
21																								
22																								
23																								
24																								
25																								

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

### CERTIFICATION

STATE OF ALASKA )

THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT )

# I, CINDY S. CARL, do hereby certify:

- (1) That the foregoing pages contain a full, true, and correct transcript of proceedings in the above-entitled matter, transcribed by me, or at my direction and supervision, to the best of my knowledge and ability.
- (2) That I have been certified for transcript services by the United States Courts.
- (3) That I was certified for transcript services by the Alaska Court System prior to January 1, 1993.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED:

BY: Cendy S. Car

Cindy S. Carl

Certified Court Reporter

DATE: 3/20/95



1	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
2	MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
3	
4	
5	
6	OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT
7	PUBLIC HEARING
8	COOK INLET SALE 149
9	
10	
11	
12	Minerals Management Service 6th Floor Conference Room
13	949 East 36th Avenue Anchorage, Alaska 99503
14	
15	Friday, March 3, 1995 2:00 o'clock p.m.
16	
17	
18	
19	MMS PANEL MEMBERS
20	Judith Gottlieb
21	Regional Director, Alaska Region of MMS Barry Boudreau
22	Regional Supervisor for Field Operations Dr. Ray Emerson
23	DEIS Project Leader, Leasing and Environment Office
24	
25	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording. Transcript produced by transcription service.

#### ANCHORAGE, ALASKA - FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1995

3 (On record at 2:05 p.m.)

(Tape No. 1 of 2)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Welcome to the hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Federal Oil and Gas Lease Sale 149 in Cook Inlet. The area that's discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement is shown on the map behind me.

My name is Judy Gottlieb. I'm the Regional Director for the Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Region. Other panel members with me include Mr. Barry Boudreau, who's the Regional Supervisor for Field Operations, and Dr. Ray Emerson, who's the Project Leader for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in the Leasing and Environment Office.

This is our first public hearing; others will be held next week in Kenai, Homer, and Kodiak. And this morning we did have a teleconference with a couple of people in Seldovia.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive the views, comments, and suggestions of interested individuals and representatives of local government and other organizations on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. But before we start, I'd just like to give you a little bit of background.

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement -- and we do have extra copies there if you'd like -- covers approxi-

mately 2 million acres which are being considered for leasing, or about 37 percent of the entire planning area.

Minerals Management Service has the responsibility to fulfill mandates set out in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Oil Pollution Act. Also, oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammals Protection Act, the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Occupational Health and Safety Act, Coastal Zone Management Act, and many others. In addition, the Minerals Management Service has in place regulations and operating regulations that are designed to make offshore operations safe and clean.

Discharges from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas exploration and production activities will be subject to the Environmental Protection Agency's national pollution discharge elimination system permits. Under a local memorandum of agreement between the MMS and EPA on federal platforms, the MMS has agreed to conduct these permit compliance inspections of Outer Continental Shelf facilities in conjunction with normal drilling and production inspections.

Under the agreement, we may also collect samples of the discharges and provide them to EPA for independent analyses. In federal waters, the MMS has been conducting these kind of permit compliance inspections in Alaska since 1989, specifically during the exploratory drilling operations in the

Chuckchi and Beaufort Seas. We are aware that EPA recently fined companies in the upper Cook Inlet for violations of the permit conditions related to the discharges that exceeded the permit limits, mostly for sanitary and domestic waste, but also for oil and grass -- sorry -- oil and grease discharges.

The MMS recently completed a water quality study in Cook Inlet which examined hydrocarbon concentrations in water, sediments, and in mussels at the regional scale and found no evidence of hydrocarbon contamination. The MMS study did not look for contaminants relating to sanitary and domestic wastes. However, the study did perform sensitive life stage bioassays which indicated no harmful levels of contaminants in general. These study results are discussed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Environmental Impact Statement represents approximately three years of preparation, which included such actions as the call for information, area identification, and scoping. You have been a part of this process, and through your earlier comments, as well as being invited once again today to give us your comments. The Environmental Impact Statement is a very important element in the decision process. The law under which we operate requires that the Secretary of Interior balance national public policy goals. The law requires considerable consultation with the Governor, balancing national needs with the well-being of local citizens.

We want everyone here to understand that MMS does not take this proposal lightly and that we approach all leasing decisions very cautiously and carefully. For example, as a result of public input directly from you, the MMS deleted a majority of the Shelikof Strait portion of the planning area, which included about 358 blocks and approximately 1.7 million acres, from our original leasing proposal.

Also, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement contains mitigating measures that have, for the first time, been committed to and made part of the proposed action and the alternatives at this early phase of the process. This was a decision that was made at previous public hearings here in Alaska. There are also additional potential mitigating measures proposed for analysis that a Secretarial decision to include those additional mitigating measures will be made upon approval of a notice of sale.

I'll call today's speakers in the order in which they've registered, and if you wish to speak but have not already signed up, please see Dick Roberts, who's sitting over there by the door. We have just a few rules I'd like to ask you to follow to ensure that the hearing runs smoothly.

If you'd please state your name and address, the organization or agency you represent. I may ask you to spell your name out so we make sure the court reporter gets it accurately. If comments could be no more than about 10 minutes, we

would appreciate that as well. If you have prepared written testimonies, please give us a copy for the court reporter for the official record.

Our recorders are making a verbatim transcript of the hearing. Everything that is spoken when the hearing is in session will be recorded. Copies of the transcript are available through Cindy and Robert Carl, who are here today, through Executary Court Reporting Services.

The purpose of this hearing is to improve the quality of the Environmental Impact Statement before it's put in final form. Speakers will not necessarily be questioned unless a member of the panel wishes to have some facts clarified or obtain additional information. We're interested in understanding your views on the Environmental Impact Statement.

The comment period for the document closes on April 19th. Until that time, we will accept written comments and statements from anyone who would prefer to make written rather than oral comments. And those written comments and statements should be sent to us, and Mr. Dick Roberts will provide information to you if you have any questions on our address. Again, the comment period is April 19th.

For those of you who are visiting our building today, you may have seen a few security guards around. IRS, late yesterday, received word that they have an irate taxpayer, and they ordered the guards for our own -- for all of our safety

today.

Our first speaker this afternoon, then, is Pam Miller. If you'd come up to the microphone, please.

(Pause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. PAM MILLER

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Pam Miller, and I'm representing Greenpeace Alaska here today. The address is Post Office Box 104432, Anchorage, Alaska 99510.

First of all, I want to start out with a quote from a poet, Muriel Rukyser (ph) from, "The Life of Poetry."

"Dead power is everywhere among us,
in the forest chopping down the songs,
at night in the industrial landscape,
wasting and stiffening the new life,
in the streets of the city throwing away the day.
We wanted something different for our people,
not to find ourselves an old reactionary republic
full of ghost fears,
the fears of death and the fears of birth.
We want something else."

As I said, I'm here representing Greenpeace and our approximately 6,000 members in Alaska and about 1.7 million supporters nationwide.

First of all, I feel that you've greatly underestimated the resistance to your proposed action. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement states, in general, that public responses were somewhat negative, and I believe this is an understatement. Opposition is strong and reasonable in the face of known threats to subsistence, commercial fishing, recreation, and tourism, the way of life that sustains the communities that will be most directly affected by your decisions.

These are the groups that have expressed written opposition thus far to the sale: in the form of resolutions by the Ninilchik Traditional Council; the D'Naina Traditional Council; the Chugachmuit Environmental Protection Consortium, which represents the villages of Port Graham, Nanwalek, Chenega Bay, and Tatitlek; and then Chickaloon Village United Fishermen of Alaska; and virtual opposition as expressed in scoping meetings from people of the other communities that would be most directly affected and other fishing and environmental organizations representing thousands of members.

I urge you to treat this opposition with the respect it deserves by deleting Lease Sale 149.

MMS decisions about whether to proceed with leasing and development are inconsistent, unqualified, and biased toward development. I ask the following questions not rhetorically but with real questions about why decisions have been so seemingly arbitrary:

How do you justify canceling the lease sale in the

Chuckchi Sea and not that of lower Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait? It is not demonstrably less ecologically sensitive. The subsistence cultures along the coast here are no less dependent upon a healthy marine ecosystem. It is arguably more important for commercial fishing if value can be measured in dollars. And as you know, lower Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait supports a commercial fishing industry worth hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

Why is there a moratorium on leasing and development in -- excuse me -- on development of leases in Bristol Bay? If leasing were to commence in Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait, is the pressure for the dreaded buy-back likely to be any less than in Bristol Bay? We saw historically that the pressure for a buy-back in Kachemak Bay was highly effective, and this area is not so far removed from that.

Why is there a moratorium in most areas of the country, in large part as a result of the National Academy of Science's determination of the inadequacy of information necessary to make sound leasing decisions? Our scientific understanding in all areas reviewed by NAS -- physical oceanography, ecology, and socioeconomics -- is qualitatively meager for Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait compared with the areas reviewed explicitly by the National Academy. No such review was done for Cook Inlet/Shelikof Strait, nor has a comprehensive assessment been made to understand the chronic and

cumulative effects of development here.

I did not find answers for these questions in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and request that your agency consider these questions in the final EIS.

Here are some of the reasons that we believe that the lower Cook Inlet/Shelikof Strait has a higher and better purpose than offshore oil and gas development:

Leasing and development in the area that still suffers the long-term and chronic effects of the Exxon Valdez oil spill is counter to and inconsistent with the restoration mandate of the EVOS Trustee Council. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on scientific research, land acquisition, and other activities in an effort to restore damages from the Exxon Valdez oil spill.

You have trivialized the long-term damage caused by EVOS to ecological systems and human communities of the spill-affected areas. Some of the important points that I think are missed in the DEIS:

First of all, recovery is patchy and incomplete.

While some species have shown evidence of recovery, others are experiencing ongoing injuries and delayed recovery.

Secondly, long-term effects occur most visibly in the intertidal zone and in species that either breed or feed in the intertidal and shallow subtidal zone. Oil-contaminated mussels continue to be a primary cause of long-term effects. Several

species experiencing long-term effects depend on mussels for a significant portion of their diet. And because of ongoing long-term effects, the time period for recovery is yet unknown.

The extreme trauma caused by the Exxon Valdez oil spill to subsistence and commercial fishing based communities in the path of the spill has not yet been mended. The root cause of these problems was the breakdown of activities associated with subsistence and commercial fishing: the sharing and harvest of natural resources.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement also fails to address the issue of environmental justice as mandated by the President's Executive Order No. 12898 on federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations. The proposed action is counter to even Department of Interior's own stated Strategic Implementation Plan on environmental justice. This action disproportionately affects subsistence communities in the region. The public process outlined in the Plan has failed to adequately ensure protection of subsistence.

The DEIS states,

"Generally, the coast in the proposed sale area and the marine environment offshore contain some of the most beautiful shore and ocean features in the world. The aesthetics are based on the near pristine environment."

And secondly, again quoting,

"Lower Cook Inlet and the Kenai Shelf are among the most productive high-latitude shelf areas in the world during the summer months."

Unquote. The high ecological values of the area are, in part, reflected by the unsurpassed system of protected areas in the region. These areas are too precious for their ecological, cultural, spiritual, and economic values to risk for short-term profits of offshore oil and gas development.

The area encompasses or borders five national wild-life refuges, four national parks, and the state's highest concentration of designated critical habitat areas. And I believe that the DEIS discussion of the importance and value of these areas was incomplete. For example, Chugach State Park was omitted entirely from the discussion. The most recent recognition of Kachemak Bay as an international shore bird reserve is significant and also not included in the Draft EIS.

Then I wonder why MMS does not respect the recommendations of its own sister agencies, for example, Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service, in considering the proposed action. The National Park Service has said,

"OCS activities could be counter-productive to efforts initiated by federal/state natural resource trustees to restore resources injured by the Exxon Valdez oil spill. We recommend

that any leasing in lower Cook Inlet and
Shelikof Strait be deferred until the full
extent of injury to trust resources, including
those of the National Park Service, is known and
the damaged resources have recovered to appropriate pre-spill conditions."

We believe that has not yet occurred. And as I mentioned earlier, recovery -- the length of time for recovery necessary is unknown.

The designation of Shelikof Strait as critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act for steller sea lions, which are about to rise to the dubious distinction of endangered status in this area, is another consideration I think minimized in the DEIS. The DEIS minimizes the threat of disturbance to this species that is also highlighted by the steller sea lion recovery team. The area serves as critical habitat for other species at risk: harbor seals, belugas, steller eider, marbled miralets, fin and humpback whales, to name a few. The importance of the area to year-around use by fin whales, documented by Kenai National Wildlife Refuges, is not discussed in the DEIS.

The DEIS does also not reflect the lack of basic knowledge concerning distribution and dynamics of key ecological species and habitats. The extent and importance of sea bird foraging areas is insufficiently treated.

MS. MILLER: Are you keeping time here? How much time do I have?

MS. GOTTLIEB: You're doing okay.

MS. MILLER: Okay. All right. I have just a little bit more.

BY MS. MILLER (Resuming):

MMS is bowing to the temptation to treat lower Cook
Inlet and Shelikof Strait as a sacrifice area based on the fact
that it -- existing infrastructure exists, even though this is
widely separated from this frontier area of lower Cook Inlet
and Shelikof Strait. We request that you do not grant access
to the oil and gas industry to this area, if solely because of
the industry's contemptible history in upper Cook Inlet and the
lack of an adequate regulatory structure to ensure safety and
environmental protection.

The DEIS lacks a cogent analysis of the poor regulatory structure as well as fates and effects of waste streams currently affecting Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait. And I'll just give some brief examples, and we'll list these exhaustively in our written comments.

Recent discovery of 4,200 violations of Clean Water

Act permits and subsequent \$1.5 million enforcement action by

EPA, which was made only after the violations were made public

by Trustees for Alaska, Greenpeace, and Alaska Center for the

Environment. We believe the enforcement action is weak because

it addresses less than one-quarter of the violations that we know about, and it also does not seek maximum penalties.

There's a lax permit structure allowing industry the license to pollute. From '87 to 1992, offshore oil platforms in Cook Inlet discharged 7-1/2 million gallons of produced waters, three -- 31.5 million gallons of drilling wastes, these containing acute toxins such as petroleum, mercury, cadmium, formaldehyde. There's lax regulatory oversight of pipelines and tanker safety in Cook Inlet. The industry has resisted efforts to instill better safety measures such as tanker tug escorts.

And there's a high level of risk from seismic activity. The DEIS states that it is situated in one of the most
active seismic zones in the world. In addition to that, sea
ice conditions and hazards from extraordinary wind occurrence
make Cook Inlet one of the most dangerous places to operate oil
tankers in the world.

There is a lack of effective spill cleanup methodologies for Cook Inlet. The Oil Spill Commission report stated -- and I think their analysis is much more in-depth than Minerals Management Service's own in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement -- I quote:

"The extreme environmental conditions in Cook
Inlet, with tides of 30 feet and currents of 8
knots, cause spreading to occur so rapidly that

б

effective response with mechanical recovery is not likely to be successful."

And we know also that other methods of spill cleanup are unproven.

MMS has attempted to use the CIRCAC and MMS studies to conclude that Cook Inlet has a clean bill of health. This is scientifically unfounded given the short-term nature of the studies, few sampling stations, and questionable credibility of the CIRCAC contractor. We urge the independent evaluation and design of a comprehensive study to determine chronic and cumulative effects in the Inlet and the National Academy of Science's review of adequacy of information for Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait.

Recent studies suggest that -- and this is a quote from a scientific paper published in the <u>Auk</u>:

"Chronic impacts may be a more significant cause of sea bird mortality than large spills. The subtle and long-term effects of chronic oil pollution are likely to be extremely damaging to sea bird populations and to be politically difficult to stop."

This is in a paper by DiBorsma (ph), 1994.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not accurately represent the value of Cook Inlet fisheries. Upper Cook Inlet is not discussed and represents an additional multi-

million-dollar value. The DEIS does not discuss recent studies indicating a much higher level of productivity and diversity of the northern Inlet for planktonic organisms and larval fish species. This study, that I have a copy of, was suppressed by ARCO, so I'd like to make this known to you. Upper Cook Inlet is likely to be affected by chronic and catastrophic oil spills and pollution from lower Cook Inlet development.

And finally, the energy analysis included does not represent an accurate consideration of an alternative to the proposed action because it does not reflect state-of-the-art thinking on the potential for renewable energy and efficient -- and efficiency to surpass the need for fossil fuel development. And Dorothy Childers will address some energy arguments that we would like to make. Thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Thanks, Pam.

(Pause)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Next we have Marc Lamoreaux.

(Pause)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Marc, what I said in my introduction is maybe you'll spell your last name so the court reporter gets it properly, please.

MR. LAMOREAUX: Okay. It's L-a-m-o-r-e-a-u-x.

MS. GOTTLIEB: And if you'd state who you're with, please.

COURT REPORTER: Could I get you to spell the last

б

name again?

MR. LAMOREAUX: Yeah. L-a-m-o-r-e-a-u-x. And it's Marc with a "c."

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MARC LAMOREAUX

Okay. And I'm with Cook Inlet Marine Mammal Council.

I'm the Research Facilitator. These are the Native marine

mammal hunters and users in the Inlet, especially the upper

Inlet, with the beluga hunters being the core group of initi
ators. Cook Inlet Marine Mammal Council is preparing a written

statement, which I hope will be considered before prosecuting

this sale.

My basic position is that further oil development in the Cook Inlet should not proceed till there has been adequate testing for the effects of development to date, as well as research to better understand the potential effects of the proposed development. There is a paucity of data from the upper Inlet.

ment to analyze for petroleum pollution. Mollusk reproduction tests conducted by Minerals Management Service failed when the mollusks died from suspended sediments. That such tests were conducted highlights the poor state of scientific understanding of the (indiscernible). We don't even know what kind of bottomfish should be tested for petroleum hydrocarbon effects in the upper Inlet. These fish and the enzyme tests may be the

best tests to date for oil pollution, and they should be done before leasing out the Inlet.

The Cook Inlet beluga tissue sampling for analysis of oil pollutants has been opportunistic and far from comprehensive. Some archive tissues should be analyzed for back-cast baseline data for a range of pollution indicators. Those studies which haven't been done yet. Marine mammal tissues should contain indicators of petroleum pollution as these toxins accumulate up the food chain.

The Cook Inlet Marine Mammal Council intends to begin supplying samples of marine mammal tissues for archival and analysis this summer. National Marine Fisheries Service and probably Minerals Management Service will help with this project. Beluga livers should be analyzed for several indicators of petroleum hydrocarbons. These include metabolites and biomarkers, such as enzymes and remnants of petroleum parent compounds.

Paul Becker, advisor of the Marine Mammal Tissue
Archival Program, is now confident in the DNA addict analysis,
which looks at changes in molecules attached to liver DNA
resulting from petroleum hydrocarbons. And we intend to get
these tests conducted as well. Also, heavy metals, there's a
long list of them, such as venadium, may accumulate in beluga
blubber from oil and gas pollution. We also want to see
analysis for organic chlorines and other pollutants.

The Cook Inlet harbor seals should also be considered for sampling. None seem to be reported in the Marine Mammal Tissue Archival Program documentation. But these should be available from Council hunters as well. Natives are understandably concerned about these pollutants which accumulate in marine mammal tissues since this is their food. Some hunters have reported an increase in lesions, tumors, blubber irregularities, and other maladies in beluga tissues, and these should be sampled and analyzed as well.

(Cough) Is there any water around here?
MS. GOTTLIEB: Sure.

(Pause - Whispered comments)

### BY MR. LAMOREAUX (Resuming):

It is a morbid joke that dead beluga washed ashore in some areas of eastern Canada are classifiable as miniature toxic waste sites. Although commercial and sport hunting originally depressed populations of beluga in the St. Lawrence Gulf, pollution seems to have depressed their rate of reproduction to the extent that they cannot repopulate. It is now thought that the Cook Inlet does not flush itself as was once thought, but rather, the water sloshes back and forth like in a bathtub. The marine mammal subsistence resources may be swimming in an accumulation of toxic brew.

I heard last night that the Minerals Management Service projects a 64-percent chance, probability, of major oil

spill from 1,000 to 250,000 barrels, and if only 10 percent of oil is usually recovered from Cook Inlet spills because of extreme tides, ice, et cetera, this is an unacceptable risk level to the aquatic ecology upon which subsistence resources depend.

There is currently a moratorium on offshore oil/gas development on the West and East Coasts of the Lower 48. Sales off Kodiak and Shelikof Strait have been deleted from the sale due to public opinion, often from fishermen who depend on aquatic resources, as well as the Chuckchi sales have been spoken out against by the whalers up there. And the resources in the Cook Inlet are no less important.

The Cook Inlet beluga stock is discrete, being reproductively isolated from other beluga in the Bering and Beaufort Seas. Over the last year, official National Marine Fisheries Service estimates of the number of beluga in the Cook Inlet population have ranged from around 300 to around 1,200. They are classified as a strategic stock, which mandates further study of their population parameters under the MMPA. Their migration routes and times when they might rely on the area that's slated for oil development are not well known.

Similar comments apply to the Cook Inlet harbor seals, whose populations are in trouble across the northern Pacific Gulf Rim. And of course, the steller sea lion, but they're down a little farther. So I wonder how you can assure

us that the oil development will not disrupt these migrations on the -- of the beluga, which are the subsistence resources for CIMMC.

Studies of all these factors are planned by National Marine Fisheries Service and CIMMC. Oil leases are -- oil lease sales should await consideration of these results, and you should certainly consult with Native hunters about how to minimize impacts to beluga if you do end up going ahead with this development.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks, Marc. Got some.....

MR. LAMOREAUX: And we have some other members of our Council here who might like to comment.

MS. GOTTLIEB: That would be great.

MR. LAMOREAUX: There's Denty Owens and.....

(Pause - Whispered comments)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Hi, Denty.

MR. OWENS: Hi, Judy.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DENTY OWENS

My name is Denty Owens. I live and subsist in the Cook Inlet waters here. The Cook Inlet waters are a part of my harvest for my food. I might like to say a couple of things.

Starting from the beginning of our season, we start with the hooligan. It's just a small fish that come in to spawn in the -- on the sandbars and on the river sides of Cook Inlet. And should this be destroyed, there goes part of our

livelihood in the sense that we utilize these little hooligans, and not only the hooligans utilized are not only -- we utilize these hooligans, but also the seagulls, and which the seagulls also feed us as we gather their eggs in the springtime.

Should these hooligans be destroyed because of a major oil spill or some kind of contaminants, it would greatly affect not only the hooligan and the seagull and then on down the line, but we also utilize the seals in the Cook Inlet. And the beluga is our major source of food from this area. Also, starting from the king salmon, after the hooligan, the king salmon, then the reds, red salmon, and the few humpies that we have here, and then the silver salmon.

I noticed -- I just skimmed over your booklets over there, and I noticed there was nothing mentioned on the beluga whales, which a lot of the population, not only in Anchorage, but it has a far-reaching effect into the coastal villages of Alaska as it's one of our major sources of food. I'm really greatly concerned because this greatly affects us. I don't know how it would affect you guys if the beef was affected in this way, but I imagine that you guys would really have an uproar about that.

I would like to see more research done on especially the belugas. Thank you very much.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks, Denty. Appreciate your coming today. Marc, are there other members from your group who

1 | wanted to testify?

MR. LAMOREAUX: (Inaudible response.) But I did find a place where there was mention of the beluga, but basically, there -- it's not knowing what the effects are going to be on them. So.....

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Thank you.

(Pause - Whispered consultation)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Is Martha here?

(No audible response)

MS. GOTTLIEB: We're running a little bit ahead of schedule from when folks signed up, but I'll be glad to call the next people who have signed up, and we may need to go back when Martha does arrive. Carl, I think you're next then.

(Pause)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CARL HILD

Good afternoon. My name is Carl Hild, H-i-l-d. I work with the Rural Alaska Community Action Program in their Subsistence and Natural Resource Department. And I haven't had an opportunity to review this entire document; things have been pretty hectic, and it's quite a substantial piece of work. I have gone over some things, though, and I have brought up some concerns, and I'd like to share those with you.

Also during the -- this last little bit of time, one of the reasons why I've been busy is the fact that I sit on the Alaska Regional Scientific Review Group for the Marine Mammal

Protection Act stock assessment process, which is going on right now. And we just have completed our meetings and our recommendations to the National Marine Fisheries Service and to Fish and Wildlife Service in regards to marine mammal stocks in the state of Alaska.

There is a real concern that I see coming up, and several of the other previous speakers here have mentioned this, and this is, I think, an area of concern, particularly the southern end of the lease sale, but also moving up through the entire region. I would like to just state that, for example, in the graphics that are provided in the back of the manuals, these are very helpful, and I think this is really advantageous to have this kind of graphic in the material.

But, for example, the one on marine mammals doesn't include the endangered species because the endangered and threatened species are on another map. Now, I don't think that's a good idea. I think if you're going to have one map for marine mammals, you list all the marine mammals on this whether they're endangered, threatened, depleted, strategic, non-strategic, whatever the classification. I think you should list all your marine mammals on one graphic.

Likewise, when you do have your endangered and threatened species, they need to all be there. Someone mentioned that the steller sea lions currently are threatened, but I understand the steller sea lion recovery team has met just

recently. It has made the recommendation that they become endangered, and I would anticipate by the April 19th deadline for written comments, that they may actually be on the endangered list. So this would be an area to take in consideration.

I think, also, when you make a listing of endangered and threatened species, you have the areas where they occur, but in many areas now, for fishery interaction, the trawl boats, fishery boats are told that they have to maintain a buffer zone around known habitats, haul-outs, rookeries. And so this might be something to consider as well. If there's a known habitat that goes up through Cook Inlet for any of these species, you may want to institute a buffer zone around these. It's not like you have the extreme ability to go up to the edge of a habitat area and protect it. So you may want to look at this.

Someone also mentioned -- this was actually an item I was going to mention later, but it fits in here -- the issue of the tides and winds in Cook Inlet. I don't know if you've ever had the opportunity to watch a bore tide come up Turnagain Arm. Now, I know this is the upper part of the Inlet, but this is rather remarkable to see that much water moving in.

And I would be real concerned, and I'd like to see some better modeling done, on how fast, if there was an oil spill done at a time when there was an extreme high tide, with possibly a bore tide, would that oil float on that -- the crest

of that wave and move well up into the Inlet very quickly. I think those types of things need to be considered. Add a little bit of wind behind it, and you can definitely have a quite influential spreading of oil in a very rapid time period.

I would like to see some kind of graphic put in here that would look at the various subsistence use areas. You have different maps showing where there is a habitat for various species, but there is no comprehensive map looking at subsistence use. And this would include all marine and coastal resources. I think it should include invertebrates, it should include plants, it should include the marine mammals and other animals that are used — utilized by the communities along Cook Inlet.

I think this graphic would give you a better outline of how far these regions are and if there needs to be buffer zones and protected areas for these habitats. It -- that would provide a better idea for scoping the size of this particular sale.

As I was getting into the document, one of the pieces I came across was Section 3.B.14., Item No. 3, that starts talking about killer whales. And one of the things that came up during the stock assessment report was the fact that the Scientific Review Group decided to break the killer whale stocks here in the state of Alaska into two groups: residents and transients.

Resident killer whales seem to stay closer to shore. They seem to interact with fisheries more often. They have different acoustical social interactions among their pods, as the transient animals who spend more time offshore do not interact with the fisheries quite as much and move over a greater area of terrain. So that in looking at this particular area, you may really want to pay some attention to those resident killer whale pods that would be at the lower end of Cook Inlet because these are the animals that do not move around quite so much and come there for (indiscernible - cough) time and could have the greatest amount of interaction.

Let's see. And I would like to refer you back to the Marine Mammal Commission has recently completed a report on killer whales using this idea of transients and residents, and they outline a lot of the additional biology there.

I would like to recommend as something I have not seen, and it -- once again, I apologize for not having gotten through the entire document -- but some additional investigation of near-shore areas. This is not intertidal; this is not tidal areas, but near shore.

One of the things that has come up as we've been evaluating the drop in the population of harbor seals in the Gulf of Alaska -- there's been a significant drop, starting in the late '70s and has just continued -- the islands off the southern end of Kodiak, the pup counts there are down by 90

б

percent over the past 20 years. This is just an unbelievable drop in that time period, and the concern is that it's not so much that the pups are dying immediately, but it appears that the juveniles are not surviving.

The pups are not surviving through the yearling stage, and it's during this time period they're feeding near shore. They don't have the ability to dive deep, so they're staying close to shore for their survival. And, you know, there's investigation going on now to get better information on that. And this is an area I think would be real critical for the harbor seal habitat areas at the southern end of your sale area, that you do some specific studies, looking at that inter -- that near-shore area.

At this point, I think I would like to just conclude and say that the use of this area is not just for the fishery industry, it's not just for the subsistence people. It's used as a transportation corridor to and from Anchorage. There's a lot of other activity that goes on in this area.

It is a concern; in fact, it is one of the most extremely sensitive areas for seismic activity in our state. There's been recommendations from the Division of Emergency Services that there may be a significant earthquake in this area, that it's overdue. We haven't had a major or great earthquake since 1964. So that the development of any of these need to be taken into consideration, the fact that we are very

likely going to have another big earthquake in this rare -area. And the impact on all those other users needs to be
taken into consideration when you're developing something like
oil and gas in this region.

The last comment I would like to make really has nothing to do specifically with these stock assessments, but it does have to do with this meeting. When I came in this afternoon, I was greeted by a guard downstairs who went through my bag. And I know, Ms. Gottlieb, you mentioned that I was — that there was an irate taxpayer, and it's an IRS issue. When I specifically asked the guard, who was only searching people who were getting on the elevator, why this was going on, he said, 'Oh, there's a meeting upstairs, and Greenpeace is going to be there.'

So unless the irate taxpayer is Ms. Miller here, sitting behind me....

MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Or Ms. Childers.
BY MR. HILD (Resuming):

Or Ms. Childers, okay. That, you know, I would think that something needs to be clarified here. You know, I'm not saying that what you told us is wrong, but someone should inform that guard of what is being said because I don't think it is appropriate if he's saying that the reason that people's belongings are searched coming into this building because Greenpeace is attending a meeting like this, I think that's

inappropriate for a guard to be saying that unless it is the truth.

So I'd just like to make that -- put that on the record and make sure that somebody does correct that.

MS. GOTTLIEB: That's fine. The....

MR. HILD: Thank you.

FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Maybe we should look outside the window and see if anybody's scaling the building.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Well, the picture of the irate taxpayer did not look anything like either of you. I'll vouch for
that.

Thank you, Carl, for those specific comments. And likewise, all the testifiers have given us very, very good specific comments where we can make improvements, and providing us issues where we can work together on before final gets published.

So, Dorothy, you're next then.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. DOROTHY CHILDERS

My name is Dorothy Childers, C-h-i-l-d-e-r-s, and I'm also -- I'm representing myself as a resident of Cook Inlet and Turnagain Arm, and I'm also representing Greenpeace. I've worked on OCS issues for a long time, and I've never -- this is the first lease sale I've ever been involved in that actually affected my very own back yard. So I have a particular differ-

ent level of interest in this one than I have in other issues on a nationwide basis.

I wanted to focus on one aspect of this sale, that is, the energy -- this Lease Sale 149 is an energy question. Greenpeace has been critical of the OCS program for a long time on the basis of energy planning, and so I just wanted to add a little more in the way of statistics to what Pam said.

We don't believe that the Alaska OCS program provides a meaningful contribution to U.S. -- the U.S. energy future in the way of security or sustainable energy sources. The current five-year plan, of which Lease Sale 149 is a part, demonstrates this clearly, and I wanted to just give some of the statistics that we have referred to in other comments on other lease sales and on the program itself.

The entire risked mean unleased economically recoverable oil and gas resources that MMS estimates for all the OCS regions, not just Alaska, in the current five-year plan was estimated to be 18.87 billion barrels of oil equivalent. With the current U.S. annual consumption of 6 billion barrels per year, the OCS resources equal only three years of energy.

Now, of course, we understand and acknowledge that the actual production would take many years, maybe 20 to 40 years, to accomplish that, but over that period of time, produc- -- period of production time, this would lower oil imports to the U.S. by only a few percentage points on a daily

basis during those years. So the fact that it might -- is 18 billion barrels of oil overall still represents only a small amount of what we require at our current energy consumption rates -- oil consumption rates.

Lease Sale 149, according to the DEIS, has a base estimate of 500 million barrels of oil. And, by the way, the graphs and text, as far as I can tell, don't match because in the text, it says that the mean — or that the base estimate is 500 million barrels, but in the charts, it says 200. And maybe I just misread them, but I couldn't make them match. So I was just going to go on the higher figure, 500 million barrels of oil, for today.

That equals about 29 days of oil -- days -- at our current consumption rate. If that oil was utilized over the document's estimated 18 years of production, this would equal only .44 percent. That's less than 1 percent of U.S. daily consumption, again, offsetting a very small amount of imported oil. We think this is a clear demonstration of this lease sale's failure to provide any meaningful amount of energy, aside from the fact that we think that renewable energy sources have many more advantages besides just offsetting imported oil.

From an economic perspective, the OCS program averages -- and these figures may be slightly outdated, but in -- when -- in our programmatic comments, we figured that the OCS program averages 3.2 billion barrels -- I'm sorry -- \$3.2

billion per year to the Federal Treasury. This is a lot of money, and certainly, if we could cut 3.2 billion barrels from some appropriate place in the federal budget, we would advocate that.

But this is a lot of money, but it is, by contrast, a small amount compared to the savings of energy -- that energy efficiency improvements made between the years of 1973 and 1986. That's after the Arab embargo when efficiency measures were mandated in the United States. Those meager improvements and efficiencies saved \$150 billion each of those years. That's 47 times the revenue from the OCS program every year, was saved by doing the most minimal energy efficiency improvements that we could nationally.

erably higher than that, and by example, some have estimated that an increase in fuel economy for cars and light trucks to 40 miles per gallon and 30 miles per gallon, respectively, would yield 20 billion barrels of oil in savings over the next 20 to 30 years. So there's a lot of contrast between what this lease sale and even the whole OCS program in general provides to the United States and what improvements in energy efficiency and increased reliance on renewable energy sources could do.

So we don't think that holding Lease Sale 149 is a -represents a fair balance of public policy goals, as you mentioned, Judy, because if the program is designed to -- if the

purpose of the program is to create an energy source for this country, we think that there's better ways to do that.

And I also might add that the last time I had my bag checked in a public place was at the -- outside of the Exxon shareholders' meeting after the 1989 oil spill.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks, Dory. Tom, I think you're next.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. TOM LAKOSH

Good afternoon. Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony to the Minerals Management Service. My name is Tom Lakosh; that's spelled L-a-k-o-s-h. My address is P.O. Box 100648, Anchorage, Alaska 99510.

Unfortunately, I haven't had a great deal of time to examine the DEIS, but I know some glaring deficiencies, and basically, I'd first like to address the philosophy of impacting subsistence communities and subsistence harvests.

First and foremost, the nature of the remote subsistence tence communities dictates that should their subsistence harvests be adversely impacted, they are likely to be required to flee the area to sustain themselves since the cost of substituting those foods with flown-in foods is prohibitive. And essentially, any impact upon those subsistence harvests constitutes essentially genocide.

In essence, the federal government is still providing smallpox blankets to the Natives here in Alaska, the Last

Frontier, since we've managed to conquer all of the other tribes in the United States. We have the Last Frontier where we are still wiping out Natives for the production of the industrial machine of the United States.

And there is a glaring absence of subsistence users from urban communities who use the resources along the Cook Inlet. There has been as many as 10,000 subsistence permits issued to people from Anchorage that use the western shore — or eastern shore here of Cook Inlet, and I didn't see any reference to those permittees whatsoever, much less the other types of non-commercial fishermen that use those resources.

I have personally obtained subsistence permits for Cook Inlet. I'm also a commercial fisherman with a halibut IFQ for Area 3-A, and a victim of the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill. And what I see here is a underestimate -- a ten-fold underestimate of the damage to fisheries, of the actual damages to fisheries, that have been granted in Phase II-A of the Exxon Valdez trial.

I believe the estimate was from \$11.1 to \$44.5 million when, in fact, it had been well over \$300 million determined to be the damage by the jury. And I'm wondering how in heaven's name those estimates were obtained when a jury of our peers has determined that there were quite a bit more damages than have been recognized by the Minerals Management Service.

б

And that should not, by any means, be relegated to a back seat, the question of punitive damages by the industry — that were assessed against Exxon and its affiliates of \$5 billion, giving an idea to our government representatives of what type of oversight ought to be maintained in the oil industry. We have a very high regard for our natural resources, and we feel that there is a high degree of regulation necessary to provide for the safe and reasonable concurrent uses of our natural resources.

There is a high potential for what is presently considered Alaska's resources -- a high potential for damage to what is presently considered Alaska's resources, and the rights of -- the constitutional rights of Alaska and to protection of those reasonable concurrent uses should be honored.

I might make note, though, that there is a question as to whether the areas to be leased are within the jurisdiction of the federal government or that of the State of Alaska since those territories were deeded to the State of Alaska — to the Territory of Alaska and turned over to the State of Alaska when we obtained statehood, that all the waters clear to the national boundary between Big Diomede and Little Diomede were deeded to the Territory and then to the State of Alaska. So there is a question as to whether there is federal jurisdiction in this area in the first place.

But I am also -- because I was a victim of the Exxon

Valdez oil spill, I took a great deal of time in the last five and half, almost six years now that have transpired, into looking into the transportation issue of oil. And I've been actively engaged in the contingency planning process, and the industry has still denied the best available technology that was a condition of lease and permit for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and the North Shore Oil Fields, that we are not having the escort vessels that we requested, we're not having the salvage tugs that are required to cope with tanker -- disabled tanker problems in open waters.

And what I -- is -- the reason why I mentioned tankers is it's clear that the oil from this lease development will not be totally consumed at Nikiski, and it will have to be either shipped out again as crude oil or refined product. And the Impact Statement is clearly deficient in assessing the impact from shipping of the refined or crude product.

There is also a question of need of development of this oil when the industry, at this present time, is trying to obtain waivers from the provisions of law which prevent the export of oil. Their rationale for the release from this export — this oil export ban is that there is a glut of oil on the West Coast, that we can't possibly consume all of the oil we're producing in Alaska, and therefore, we have to ship it off to some foreign compy — country, therefore the — defeating the intent to decrease oil imports to protect our national

security.

It's just plain clear and simple that we cannot consume this oil on the West Coast, that your estimates of oil prices, therefore, are overestimates because the continuing slide in the international cartel in being able to maintain oil production restrictions has been driving the price of oil down in the Gulf. There's practically no difference in the price of oil between Gulf oil and the West Coast, despite the increased transportation cross through the Panama Canal. And what we have is a situation is we don't know what to do with the oil that we're already producing.

And it seems beyond me why these Native cultures would be endangered, the commercial fishing would be endangered, and all of the recreational opportunities in Cook Inlet and these national parks which have been cited, and reserves, would be endangered by such a risky venture in areas where there's such high tidal currents and ice floes. And if there were any sort of justification for the production of this oil, I can see where a cost/benefit analysis would come into play at that point.

But there is no justification for the production of that oil at this time, and I fail to see why this lease sale is even being considered when there is a glut of oil. If you can't sell the oil, I don't understand why you want to produce it, much less put all of these valuable resources at risk.

And it's not just a matter of cost/benefit analysis if the end result is going to be genocidal. I do not see that there is any option but to protect those Native cultures which have so long endured, for approximately 30,000 years, up to 30,000 years of estimates of archeological findings, and why, at this time, with such a short-sighted benef- -- a shorts -- a short-term benefit that could possibly occur, even giving a need for oil, that these cultures which have survived for that amount of time should be put in such jeopardy.

It's clearly an ethnocentric attitude that the federal government has been pursuing, and that it is time that we recognized the rights of these indigenous people to maintain their lifestyle and culture in the lands that they have occupied for millennia, and that the production -- such meager production, unnecessary production, for such a short period of time certainly cannot warrant the risk to these cultures.

I -- and I've looked also at the effects on the commercial and she- -- the commercial fisheries, and I notice that these are very vague and incomplete analyses of the resources at risk. I believe that there is, you know, commercial clam harvests on the western shore of Cook Inlet, which are not referenced here anywhere. There are, you know, all types of subsistence fisheries in the entire area which are not specifically referenced.

I believe that, you know, the analysis, above and

beyond the general questions of risk, has been fairly incomplete and inexact. I believe that there is no basis for preparing a cost/benefit analysis if that were the decision to proceed with this genocidal act, and that in order to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, that there should be a total reassessment of the resources at stake and the potential impacts, including that of transportation, particularly when it's stated in this report that trawl fisheries might adversely affect the pipeline, the 12-inch pipeline, which is going to be required to transport this oil.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks, Tom. Why don't we take about a five-minute break, and then we'll resume.

(Off record at 3:05 p.m.)

(On record at 3:20 p.m.)

MS. GOTTLIEB: -- Environmental Impact Statement.

Tom's going to continue with a few additional comments.

BY MR. LAKOSH (Resuming):

Thank you for this opportunity to continue my comments. Unfortunately, I managed to over -- to forget about this particular phrase -- phraseology here in the analysis of the impacts of oil spills. Of particular regard I'm concerned about this sentence:

"However, the financial compensation received by the commercial fishing fleet during the cleanup process was not factored into this -- these estimates. That compensation was estimated to have exceeded, by several orders of magnitude, the revenue lost due to the spill."

And I'm highly concerned that that indicates that oil spills should be looked at as an economic benefit. And I believe that's totally abhorrent to the concept of preventing environmental damages. In effect, what it's saying, that people should be encouraged to -- or people should be encouraged to look upon oil spills as favorable because of the economic -- the favorable economic impact that they have, as opposed to the harmful environmental damage and resulting -- resultant economic impact.

And I therefore request that any -- that that particular phraseology and section of this report be stricken, and that the financial -- quote/unquote, "financial compensation from oil spill activities" be totally removed from any cost/benefit analysis due to the fact that it is the duty, under all common law of persons causing threat to the public health, safety, and decency, to mitigate their harmful effects to the public good, and that any such compensation is a liability, a civil liability, as opposed to an economic benefit.

Thank you very much.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks, Tom. Martha, we have you next, and if you would please give your name with spelling so

the court reporter can take that down, and the organization you represent.

MS. LEVENSALER: Okay.

MS. GOTTLIEB: If you are.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MARTHA LEVENSALER

My name is Martha Levensaler, L-e-v as in Victor
-e-n-s-a-l-e-r. And I'm with the National Wildlife Federation
here in the Anchorage office.

I have come today to testify against the Lease Sale 149 for a lot of different reasons. It's my understanding that the Native villages in the area are opposed to this, that there are many fishing groups, both commercial and recreational, that are opposed to this. And also, it's my gut feeling that the best way to prevent pollution damage to an area is just not to have those activities going on.

I came to Alaska in 1989 because of the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and I worked for six months with DEC in Valdez, and then I worked for three and a half years with Preston, Thorgrimson, the law firm that was on contract with the State to sue Exxon. When I first went to work for Preston, I went with a great deal of zeal, with my new responsibilities of saving the world and righting a wrong.

It didn't take me very long to feel that what I was doing, though necessary at this stage of the ac- -- of the event, was not saving anything, not helping anything, that

prevention is a hundred percent of taking care of these problems, that once an area is damaged, restoration, any amount of money thrown at it and restoration projects just -- they don't make an impact. They don't -- they do not return something that has been damaged to that degree.

And considering that this area is still suffering the effects of the oil spill, I think it's particularly unwise to be subjecting it to more — to a greater potential of pollution, and that, therefore, I am opposed to the lease sale. And that's all I had to say.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate your coming today.

MS. LEVENSALER: Okay.

MS. GOTTLIEB: David, you're next.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DAVID HARRISON

My name is David Harrison. I'm the Attorney General for Chickaloon Village, or, you might say, in traditional terms, the War Chief. I come here today to, again, express our very deep concern over the positions and the documents that the Interior Department, through the Minerals Management Service, has put out concerning our territory.

Before, when I testified before this body, at that time, I was a chief fish and game management officer for Chick-aloon Village. We have great concerns about these oil and gas developments because they are obsolete. There is no consider-

g

ation for the health of the people who are around it. There is no consideration for the health of the workers that are going to develop it, knowing that radioactivity is very common among oil and gas. It's very well documented down in the Unocal yard on the Kenai Peninsula. You would probably find a lot more documentation up on the North Slope.

Oil and gas, or any kind of energy resources that you dig out from under the surface of this Mother of ours -- that provides your life, it provides your food, that provides the clothes that you are wearing, it provides the building that you are sitting in at this present moment -- you must look farther than a couple of years ahead of you. For those that have children, do you want them to be sick? Do you want them to be unhealthy? Do you want them to have the highest education that they can? If they are ill, they cannot have that highest education because they cannot think clearly.

I bring before you today the convention on the rights of the child that President Clinton just signed approximately three weeks ago. Under Articles 24, Section 1, it says,

"The state parties recognize the right of the child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health and to facilities for the treatment of illnesses and rehabilitations of those health (sic)."

It also goes on to say, under Article 32,

"State parties recognize the right of the child to be protected from economic exploitation..."

Oil and gas lease sales, wherever they may be, not only in Cook Inlet and the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean. Over in Kuwait where, if you want more oil, just keep protecting the Emir.

"...and from the performing of any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with a child's education, or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral, or social development.

"The state parties shall take legislative, administrative, social, educational measures to ensure the implementation of these Articles. To this end, and having regard for the relevant provisions of other international instruments, state parties shall in particularly (sic) provide for appropriate penalties or other sanctions to ensure the effective enforcement of these Articles."

You sit here claiming to represent the United States in a territory that the United States does not have any authority over based upon the United Nations Charter, which the United States became signatory in 1945. Under Article 73, United States has a sacred obligation to bring the inhabitants of Alaska up to self-government. Instead, military personnel

was shipped to Alaska during World War II and resulted in what people call the state of Alaska.

However, prior to that, the United States, in their laws, in their organic documents, say that they will have our consent before they appropriate our lands or assume jurisdiction over us. In Alaska you say, 'Well, the United States bought it.' No, that is not true. That is what a lot of these teachers and history writers would like you to believe.

But when you go and you look in the archives in the Soviet Union, you will find a memorandum that the United States calls "Memorandum Descriptive," marked AA. We call it the "Koslitzof (ph) Memorandum" because after the United States bought the Russian-American Trading Company, or expended the \$7.2 million that they expended to assert this claim that they bought Alaska, Secretary Seward wrote to Czarist Russia, says, 'What did we buy?' They wrote back with this document and told him that they bought the Russian-American Trading Company and 117,600 square feet of land in New Archangel, commonly known today as Sitka.

So that is the authority that the State of Alaska and the United States government has here in my territory until such time as the United States or the State of Alaska obtains consent from the Alaska Native people, not from 576 of them, as there was during the land claims, because that Act is null and void because the majority of the adult members of Alaska

Natives, in 1971, did not have the opportunity to vote. Now, I bring this up because in 1924, all Indians were declared citizens of the United States, provided that it did not deprive them of their tribal or other property.

Myself, I am no citizen of the state of Alaska. I am not a citizen of the United States. I am a D'Nai citizen.

This is my territory to protect. In your documents, you say that we said we're the owners. In western mentality, yeah, we're owners, but in traditional mentality, no one owns our Mother. We are the caretakers, and we intend to take care of it however we can.

You may say that we're racist. Well, I was brought up in your educational system, and I probably am a little racist because of the oppression that the United States government has not only done here in Alaska but has done everywhere it has touched, outside its supposed national boundaries.

The oil and gas lease sales, or any other developments that you must dig out from underneath the ground, you promote death for all natural life. When you use the surface, you are promoting life for all natural life because Creator and our Mother gave those things to us to use. The things that are underneath the surface are like the organs in your body. the oil and the gas are like the blood that flows through your veins. The coal is the liver; the uranium, the lungs. And you can go on and relate these to your own body. Now, if you were

to take these things out of your system, what would happen to you? You'd die.

Animals are people. You may not be able to speak with them, but many indigenous people can yet to this day. I'm not one of them, but I'm here speaking for those that have no means to speak, such as the fish, the animals, the plants, the trees, the unborn children, and our future generations because what you do now, they're going to have to deal with. They're going to have to clean it up because you will already be dead and gone from old age.

My elders in the village told me when they were kids, the old people then, they were talking about all of this pollution. And the old people says, 'Oh, don't worry because young people will figure it out, and they'll learn how to deal with it.' Well, that's you guys. Now, it's us. We're still trying to figure out how to take care of it, and you guys keep dumping more and more and more on us. And the health of the people, not only the two-leggeds, the four-leggeds, the winged, the fish, they're all suffering at the actions that the United States has taken, just in the name of dollars.

This is not appropriate ideology. You cannot expect to get wealthy when your health is not there. The contaminants that these oil companies have already released in the Inlet, in Prince William Sound, on the North Slope have already damaged

б

the ecosystem in Alaska. And you're proposing more. That's insane. The reality behind what is going on here is not clear thinking. With the technology that the United States has, the technology that the international community has, there is no reason why they have to use oil and gas or coal or uranium or any of these other sources.

People complain about people on welfare and unemployment. This is part of the cause why they're on welfare and unemployment, because you do things that are not including them. This is excluding them. And you say that, 'Oh, it'll provide jobs.' Well, doesn't do me a heck of a lot of good after I get sick from the jobs that you want to provide me.

We have deep concern about this because since the last time we were here, our salmon hatchery is constructed, it is operational, and we have had two releases so far. And we're on the very end of the northern Cook Inlet. They said it couldn't be done, but it is. We have a salmon hatchery that we took no State or federal money to construct, we took no State or federal permits to construct. Our traditional sovereign tribal government says, 'We're going to build it,' and we built it as a model program for alternate economic development projects.

And our first criteria for an economic development project is, Is it environmentally safe? After that, Is it sustainable? Oil and gas is not sustainable. It's only sus-

tainable if you leave it in the ground so that it can provide the nutrients and the life for what is on surface. These are things that need to be considered.

In your report, you say all of our comments that Chickaloon Village made in Homer and in this room here are being negated because you say that you don't know whether they should be dealt with or not. They must be dealt with because you have no legal authority to propose a oil and gas lease sale in my territory without the consent of our people. The laws are very explicit; all you have to do is read them. I did not graduate high school, nor did I ever go to college, but I can still understand it because I learned how to read by the time I was in third grade. And I've done a hell of a lot of studying because my life depends upon it, and so do the life of my children and those that are not here yet.

Try and look seven generations ahead of you and ask yourself what's going to be there for them when they get here, when it's their time to deal with this. And if you cannot come up with a good answer, then you'd better not do it because you're dumping on your kids, and they don't deserve that. They don't deserve to be dumped on like the United States has been dumping on them. They don't deserve to be dumped on like the State of Alaska has been dumping on them.

People's lives are at stake when you go and try and develop these so-called resources that are the vital organs of

our Mother Earth. They're not resources; they're vital organs. And without them, this Mother of ours will die. As many of you have already seen, the earthquakes, the tidal waves, the hurricanes, all of these things are signs of purification. Our Mother is starting her purification.

Men, we have to go to a sweat lodge, a woman has her monthly moon to purify. How is our Mother Earth going to purify? How many of us are going to die because we have abused our Mother? How many of us are going to have to suffer because of the abuse of our Mother, the life-giver? She gave your life, and she gave mine. And if we protect her and keep her clean and healthy, she will grant many more people lives. But if things like this continue to happen, we are all guaranteed one thing, and that's death, at a much faster rate than Creator ever wanted it to be.

You have to live with yourselves, but I hope that you can sleep at night because what you're doing is you're killing millions of children around this Mother Earth of ours. By going over to Kuwait and protecting the Emir is one example. Supposed to be against dictatorships, but yet only when it doesn't have to do with oil and gas. The only reason the United States went to Somalia was because of oil and gas. It wasn't humanitarian aid. It had to protect the Saudi Arabian oil fields.

And now you're coming to my territory and trying to

б

tell me that you're going to allow multi-national energy corporations who the United States subsidizes into my territory to kill me and pollute the lives of all of these animals, to pollute our food. That hurts. That shows how much you care about what gives you your life. We need assistance from Minerals Management Service to start protecting people and managing these minerals in an appropriate way so that the lives of our children will be healthy, so that they can have a good education.

People are afraid about indigenous people asserting their sovereignty. What they should be more afraid of is not recognizing their sovereignty. That's what they should be afraid of, not if they recognize us. Because this land and all of these buildings, the buildings are whoever built them. The land is ours to take care of; it was never for sale. And it's not for sale today, and it won't be sale for tomorrow (sic), nor a year from now -- or at least until I'm dead.

(Off record)

(Tape Change - Tape No. 2 of 2)

(On record)

21 | BY MR. HARRISON (Continuing):

....is that I want each of you to tell me, to start with, who makes the decision on these sales. Who is going to make the decision on this particular sale, on whether they're going to do it or not?

MS. GOTTLIEB: The decision will be made either by the Assistant Secretary or by the Secretary of Interior.

BY MR. HARRISON (Resuming):

Bruce Babbitt is the Secretary of Interior. The Assistant Secretary, they got many of them. But Deere Ada (sic) is in town today. Our tribal chairman and the matriarch of our village has had a meeting with her this morning. This is one of the issues that was discussed, as well as the protection, the rights protection, of indigenous people in Alaska because the Interior Department is not doing their job. And their job, and their laws, says that they will uphold the United States Constitution.

And I just don't understand why you have not went to the villages and asked if they wanted this, in an election, in a vote, because without that, you have no authority. Without the consent of the villages in this area, you have no authority. There are five villages in this area that have come together and signed a treaty amongst ourselves. So it's not just Chickaloon you're dealing with. There's others that are like-minded. They may have a little different strategies, but the point is, oil and gas is obsolete.

And how many people are you going to kill for a dollar? What is the value of my kids? What price tag have you put on my children? Because, to me, there is no value because you cannot put a price on it. My children are not for sale,

1.7

1.9

not just so somebody can put a big bank account in some Swiss place or down in the Caribbean or wherever else they may want to try and hide their so-called fortune. 'Cause when you get sick, it knows no race.

So I hope that I have been able to touch your heart, to open your eyes, and clean out your ears so that you hear what is around you. I live in the country; I don't live in this place called Anchorage because I can't stand to hardly come here. It makes me sick to see all of this pollution.

There are many alternate means to cut down on the need of oil and gas. With all of the reserves full to the brim, why do you need more? Put people to work instead doing something clean that will feed them, that will clothe them, that will house them. Oil and gas, you can't eat it, you can't drink it. The only thing you can get from it is sick.

understand and that maybe the positions that are taken when you look at developing these so-called minerals that are vital organs of our Mother, that you will take a stronger stance for the protection of those that cannot speak or those unborn children that are yet to come, because those are the future. And remember, don't shit in your own back yard. This is mine. I want to keep it clean. And I cannot keep it clean if you don't assist me. Thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you. George, I believe you

1.8

signed up next.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. GEORGE MATZ

My name is George Matz. I'm from Anchorage here.

Nearly three years ago, Minerals Management Service held a

workshop on environmental risks that they invited a number of

people to from the local communities and fishermen, industry

and environmentalists. And I participated in this representing

the Anchorage Audubon Society, and it was a very good workshop.

There were some really outstanding consultants running this, and one of the things that really stuck with me that came out of the workshop is they questioned how the EIS process is normally run by federal agencies. And they said, well, you know, what typically happens is you have all these technical people write this very technical document, but then they ask the public to comment on this. And they'll ask, you know, 'What do you think about, you know, X number of ppm's on this -- or, you know, chemical as opposed to Y number of ppm's?' And most people don't really understand.

And you know, the -- what these consultants basically brought out is what an EIS should be doing is trying to get values from people instead of these very technical judgments on these very technical matters. And as I was thinking about what to say, I -- that really struck home to me because, you know, I know this whole EIS proce- -- this OCS process is very technical and everything, and I certainly haven't bothered to keep up

with it or read all the stacks of papers or the Draft EIS, but I certainly have a lot of values that I think are important.

And while I'm not able to tell you technically what should be done, I would like to express these values.

Let's see. I think, as you all know, this -- the area is really surrounded by some outstanding natural values and which is represented by the national parks and wildlife refuges and state parks in this whole area. And I think you also know that besides these high natural values, there's also a lot of risk to changing anything. There's -- or any kind of development in the area. Whether it be oil and gas or anything else, there's seismic risks, there's volcanoes, the ice in the Inlet, and, you know, all these things which I'm sure you're familiar with.

So given the high values and the high risks, you know, it doesn't seem to me that an oil lease is really appropriate, and especially when you consider that this area is still suffering the stress from the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and then plus the fisheries are -- the fish harvesting has been a problem. When you add all these things together, it just seems inappropriate to even be considering this.

Well, let's see. Back at this workshop we had three years ago, they -- this was brought out also. And so I brought with me the final report that was done by the consultants, and they -- and some of the things they brought out, it was a

result of the people at the workshop and what they expressed regarding the -- any environmental risks and geological risks and everything else, pretty much are -- coincide with what I'm saying now. But I would like to read here what they mentioned:

"The risk management methods used by MMS should be state-of-the-art. Unfortunately, our conclusion, based on the background documents provided to us by MMS staff, as well as what we have heard from the workshop participants, is that current MMS risk management practices and the potential of what could be done as a major contributor to many of the problems now confronting the agency...."

Let's see. I -- let's see. I didn't read that right. Oh. Well, let's see. They mention a decline -- there's a decline in public confidence and trust, a decline in oil and gas industry confidence, and a decline in morale among MMS employees.

Well, that was the -- what the consultants wrote up three years ago, and as I've mentioned, I've -- you know, I've followed this issue with OCS oil lease sales in terms of the media. I haven't read all the documents and everything, but my values and my perception of how well these values are being met is things haven't changed much. You know, you read in the paper that tankers are -- their engines are failing in Cook

Inlet, and they're about ready to be washed up and -- on the beach, and there's just a -- just ongoing oil spills and toxic waste being spilled in the Inlet.

So, you know, I think it's -- you know, basically, I would -- the point I want to make is my values are that it's just that it's not at all conceivable to have an oil lease in this area. And my perception of the problems are that things haven't changed since the -- these consultants wrote this summary of this report three years ago. So that's all I have to say.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay.

MR. MATZ: Thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks for telling us that. Bob Wolf.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. ROBERT WOLF

Hello. My name's Robert Wolf, P.O. Box 1125, Gird-wood, 783-2743. I'm here to represent UCIDA first off and myself second.

First, as representing UCIDA, the United Cook Inlet Drift Association, we've met frequently with MMS on this lease sale and given our input, and our input has always been that we would like to see no oil development north of our south line, which is the latitude of Anchor Point; 59-46-12 is our exact Loran line that we have to stay above.

In the past years, we've been losing more and more ground, drift area, where we traditionally have fished. Where

they fishery traditionally started, we've been losing more and more ground, and it's been pointed out in a few meetings that the bulk of our fishing activity doesn't take place near shore as much but in the middle of the Cook Inlet. We do fish inshore, within three miles, when the State requires us to, but most, if not all, Cook Inlet fishermen prefer fishing in the middle of Cook Inlet. That's where the bulk of the fish are; we fish the tide rips, and that's where the tide rips are.

We have requested, a lot of times, to see that area north of 59-46-12 deleted from the sale. We've got the Alternative 5; the coastal fisheries' deferral is one section, and you get a couple of shaded areas on the sides, but that middle of Cook Inlet is still up for lease. We're fairly disappointed to see that still up for lease, but obviously, when we look for where to go fishing, you go as close to the guy who's catching fish. Well, in Cook Inlet, they're pumping oil in the north, so we -- I'm sure they really want that northern part of this lease sale open.

With as much that goes on with these lease sales, I know you can't do everything; however, when you talk about managing the risks, reflecting back on things, the main risk, and most of the risk, is brunted by the commercial fishermen and the subsistence users and the sport or personal use people of the area. That is where the risk is.

If there is an oil spill, the risk for that first

year will fall on all user groups. There -- the possibilities of having to stay off of the Homer halibut grounds is there. The possibilities for the commercial fisheries to be halted completely, which has happened, exists. The possibilities of having contaminated subsistence or personal use foods definitely exists.

However, as time goes on, the risk still falls mostly on the commercial fishers. If you look at Prince William Sound, everybody says, 'Well, it's clean. There's no more oil washing up. We can go back to normal.' Well, yeah, they can go kayaking still and not see oil, and go recreational boating and not see oil. They can go halibut fishing and not see oil. However, which is one reason this lease sale had been delayed, was to find out what the effects of the Exxon Valdez oil spill was. And I think right now it's still at an early stage of information-gathering, you might say, as far as what damages have occurred.

Obviously, Prince William Sound is having trouble with their herring. What troubles that might have contributed will be argued until the next century. Likewise in Cook Inlet with the Cook Inlet sockeye run, I've had to definitely take a hard look at my business and say, 'Well, can I continue fishing, or do I need to sell out because there possibly will not be any fishing in 1996?'

Fortunately, the season last year was not a doomsday

б

season. I still had to make the moves to sell some fishing assets, a permit, to be able to, hopefully, continue to be in business this year. That Exxon oil spill is still affecting us. I mean, in that way is one. Another way is the Prince William Sound fishermen are no longer able to fish Prince William Sound. Well, they've got -- that has put more pressure on the Kodiak herring fishery. And I've been a participant in that fishery for 10 years, and it is very noticeable, the effects -- the economic effects of the Sound fishermen coming into the Kodiak area.

One example is in 1993, the Kodiak processors would not buy fish under 130-gram weight. However, after the Sound crashed that year, Icicle Seafoods came in and bought one entire district on small fish, which closed it to us local Kodiak -- quote, "Kodiak fishermen" to have any chance of harvesting of fish that were of value. There were Kodiak fishermen actually releasing those small fish 'cause their market wouldn't take it. But when the Sound fish came back, they ended up catching them, and Icicle bought them. Icicle isn't really a player down there, but if you're not buying fish in the Sound, you're going to look for some place to buy fish.

So this Exxon Valdez oil spill damage, and continuing damage, is still, I think, like I said, in the early stages and needs to be more documented by an environmental impact statement like this. I, for the -- I butchered over 130,000 pounds

of halibut myself in the past 12 years, and this year I fished off of Point Elrington and off of Prince William Sound, and it's the first time ever I've seen halibut with abnormal looking gonads.

There's a lot of things that could be cropping up that are related to the spill that we might not ever know about. With funding being cut, the federal government's out of the lawsuit, the State government's out of the lawsuit.

They're not pouring much more into it. We had the Exxon Valdez Trustees Council, which is doing their work as best they can, but to start wanting to do another lease sale so close to this disaster is a little hard to take, and therefore, you know, you're running into a lot more opposition. And rightfully so, because the people at risk are the local people in the area.

And so for UCIDA, I would like to see that area of 60-46-12 North still deleted from the sale tract. It'd be like putting an espresso stand in the middle of Seward Highway, where you have to dodge it. And you kind of know it's there coming up at 36th Street and you've got to dodge it, but it still is going to mess up your traffic pattern. And that's what our fishery -- we drift sometimes up to 10 miles of drift, and to have to pull up out of a good fishing set to jump over a half a mile to miss this oil rig is going to impact our fishery.

We've been impacted by oil development. I bought my

permit in 1987, and I've been locked in legal lawsuits with oil spills since that date. We had the Glacier Bay spill in 1987, and I've been a plaintiff ever since, unfortunately.

And then some more on my own personal views, as a victim of that spill and the Glacier Bay spill, we've taken the brunt of these mistakes -- the fishermen have. The Anchorage population per se, unless you're a fisherman or something, aren't really adversely affected by it economically. You might be outraged, but to be a fisherman and to have a season yanked out from under you and another season just totally thrown in disarray within two years of each other, personally, it gets really hard to take, and it's getting old.

We have Exxon with their same arrogant manner, and it's hard to -- as a citizen of the United States, to let my government give these oil companies a chance to do this to me again. It really -- it -- my salmon season is only one month a year. It's not a long time; however, that's the bulk of my income. I commercial halibut fish in Area 3-A, and that's also a bulk of my income. My herring income has been affected year after year, and it's -- it hits home.

And that's one place where I think these environmental impact statements should also look for a better view of
what it might do had there be a spill (sic), is you need the
input from the people who've been affected by spills in the
past to find out what traumas, stresses, and things that have

affected their own personal lives. It's -- I've shared them with you before in other meetings.

So I think that to start your lease sale right now is still a little bit too close to the Exxon Valdez data-gathering stage. There's still no explanation on what exactly Prince William Sound herring is doing, from a 16,000-ton quota to a 1,000-ton quota, and then a zero quota, something happened. Seeing abnormal looking halibut gonads made me wonder, especially when that area was directly right there at the outlet of Prince William Sound where that oil went to.

There's a lot of unanswered questions yet, and I think that that needs to be definitely considered if you continue this environmental impact statement further. And I think that's all I have.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Appreciate it.

MR. WOLF: Mm hmm (affirmative).

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you very much. Terry Burrell.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. TERRY BURRELL

Thank you very much. I appreciate your coming and listening. I'm not just an Anchorage person, I consider myself a Matanuska Valley person, a Ninilchik person, a Seldovia person. I think most anyone that you talk to from Anchorage doesn't have interests all over Southcentral if not complete northern parts of the state, you're not just hearing from Anchorage.

My name is Terry Burrell. I would support 149. I'm been here 36 years. I was part of the founding membership of Alaska Center for the Environment. I'm extremely concerned about how the federal government treats the resources, and I appreciate their stand that they have taken on hunting and protecting, trying to get a balance in the hunting venue. I also feel that we have a balance here on the oil discovery also.

When the Exxon Valdez spill hit, I sent my entire monthly social security tak- -- check to protect Seldovia Bay. The social security is small, but it was well earned. When -- in the '70s, when I was trying to make it on my own -- I'm post-polio syndrome now, but I went without heat and food in order to stay in my home. And the government then was asking 12 percent on top of your -- it didn't matter if you had enough for your house, it was 12 percent straight for self-employed people for social security.

So I figure my social security check had really good meaning to send it so that we could protect the bay there. And I also, during a period of time, I guess you could call me a subsistence person because I ate freezer throw-away salmon sent over for my dogs. I've never asked for welfare or food stamps.

The drug and alcoholic problem is something that is really tearing us apart. It -- the -- our non-Alaskan, our non-U.S. Chickaloon Village speaker who says that besides he's

fighting for sovereignty, he spoke of the concern for children's health. His thrust should have been to stop alcohol, drugs, and illegitimacy among his children, his very young children. Millions of dollars in land claims and still millions of dollars in food stamps, Medicaid, welfare, energy assistance, drug rehabilitation pour in from the State and the U.S. government.

The State spends more to regulate our very important departments, such as Fish and Game, Mining, Minerals, Timber, and none of these other industries break even to support their own departments. Oil and gas, the profits from oil and gas come in and make these very important regulatory agencies viable. We wouldn't have the money to protect our other industries if we don't have the oil and gas money.

Hatcheries are greatly supported by oil and gas revenues. If it didn't come directly from the oil and gas, you have grants. You've had large grants that have come in to establish these hatcheries. I'm all for upgrading and making our fisheries a sustainable and growing industry, but when you talk about 85 percent of all state revenues come from oil and gas, and this is based on the 90-percent State royalty/10-percent federal government.

You also need to know that 30 percent of every

Alaskan's income was paid by oil and gas, the -- another largesse that comes from the federal government. I would like for

you to refer to the ISA (ph) Report, University of Alaska. I don't have to ever expect to donate another social security check because of the tremendous changes in safety regulations, with the emphasis on prevention of violations and preventions of spills.

The close-in leases that you're talking about, you have the ability to contain, to prevent, all of these measures. We've been drilling for 30 years. In 1969, you could have said no to ANWR. You can't say no now because of you need to have reasonable sustainable development. The fishermen have, because of the oil industry, had low-income loans, tremendously low-income loans. They have had years where they don't have to pay anything because the fish has been -- and this was before the spill -- because the fish harvest was up or it was down, or it was whatever. The State has forgiven, a lot of years, for them to be able to keep their boats.

They also -- many of them I know of claim food stamps. And everybody collects a thousand dollars or more per family member. I think 60-48 North can be developed. I think that money to buy permits comes from oil. The oil spill settlement paid thousands of dollars to each and every fisherman for work that they didn't do based on past performances.

So I really feel that Alaska, financially, has not only been made whole, but it has been able to grow and to not only subsist -- I mean, I don't really personally feel that

there is a true subsistence in Alaska. If you take away your food stamps, your energy assistance, your welfare checks, take all of that away, and then say, 'Okay. Now, subsist.' True subsistence does not exist in Alaska. We are an oil economy.

We need to stop the interception of Alaskan stock, salmon stock, fisheries, in the open sea. I believe that we have had a causal decline because of the problems of other states, Japan, before we had the 200-mile limit, even the violations here. Where is your regulation going to come from then -- there?

I really support the -- your program because I feel that it is not only do-able, but it is safe, and heavens, it is totally necessary. Thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you very much, Terry. And George Schmidt.

MR. SCHMIDT: Did you call me?

MS. GOTTLIEB: Yes, George.

MR. SCHMIDT: I can't hear very well.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Yes.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. GEORGE SCHMIDT

My name is George Schmidt, and I've been a resident of Alaska since 1948 and a continuous resident of Anchorage since 1962.

Is it all right if I read this?

MS. GOTTLIEB: That'd be perfectly fine.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

BY MR. SCHMIDT (Resuming):

I favor scheduling sale of the acreage in lower Cook
Inlet and northwest Shelikof Strait. Declining production in
the United States with respect to imports would seem to dictate
doing everything reasonable to restore the balance. Currently,
we import over 50 percent of our petroleum needs. We don't
know if there's petroleum in the area. Before locking it away,
however, prudence would dictate that we find out.

There will always be some risk in petroleum extraction. There is risk in nearly everything. But the U.S. has one of the safest records, a record that improves every year. If we insist on importing more and more oil without exploring our own potential basins, we will justify the term "pollution exporters." Our record is good. Let us help it to become better by exploring this high-potential area.

Thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you.

(Pause)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Is there anyone else who would care to testify?

(Pause)

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. KEVIN TABLER

Yes, thank you. My name is Kevin Tabler; it's T-a-bl-e-r. I'm the Land Manager for Union Oil Company of California, and I've got a few prepared comments, and I've provided written comments for you that I might have.

Union Oil Company of California appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Minerals Management Service Draft Environmental Impact Statement and proposed notice of sale for Cook Inlet Sale 149.

The MMS is to be commended on its thorough investigation and analysis of the potential socioeconomic and environmental impacts that the Cook Inlet sale would have on the surrounding community and on the Inlet itself. We are nearing the final stages of a very lengthy, exhaustive, and very expensive identification process which has begun many years ago.

The subsequent 1992 call for information and nomination requested information which was used to identify potential conflicts in the coastal management plans. Environmental concerns, mitigating measures, lease terms, stipulations, and conditions were all to be identified. Comments were received at that time from industry, State of Alaska, federal agencies, environmental groups, fishing groups, local and area representatives, and, of course, private citizens.

Numerous workshops and scoping community meetings with groups having a vested interest were conducted throughout the region to inform the public and to gather comments on the proposed sale, with more of those planned meetings held this month. All this data was collected and forms the basis of the Draft EIS. Relevant comments and concerns expressed have been

addressed in the Draft EIS, resulting in a significant reduction in the sale area.

My point being, a very comprehensive review has been conducted, confirming that the 30 years-plus history of oil and gas exploration and production has not only been compatible with multiple use of Cook Inlet, but has indeed been an extremely critical component in communal development, socioeconomic enrichment of the area. Many environmental studies have been conducted over the years on the hydrology of Cook Inlet and on the impact of oil and gas industry discharges in Cook Inlet. These studies have concluded that no adverse environmental impact has occurred.

I've attached to my comments a copy of three of the most recent Cook Inlet studies, each evaluating different parameters, conducted by Union Oil Company of California,

Marathon Oil Company, CIRCAC, the Citizens Advisory Council,
and, of course, one that you're very familiar with, the MMS study. All three are positive confirmations of the good health of Cook Inlet. Not only has Cook Inlet not experienced environmental degradation, but users of the Inlet have invested in a spill response cooperative, and this is CISPRI, located in Cook Inlet and employing the most sophisticated oil spill response equipment, manpower, and training available.

Oil and gas resources in the state of Alaska play an important role in the energy policy of the United States. Oil

and gas exploration and development in Cook Inlet has had a significant positive fiscal impact on the state of Alaska and local municipalities and communities. There is no indication, in 30 years-plus of oil industry operations within the Cook Inlet basin, of any harmful effects to fish and wildlife and their habitats, or human use for subsistence, recreation, or commercial exploitation.

Lease stipulations, mitigating measures, and conditions derived through the EIS process will ensure adequate safeguards exist to protect the environment and provide for responsible oil and gas development. We therefore encourage the evaluation process to continue, culminating in the best interests of the people of the United States by holding Cook Inlet Sale 149 on schedule.

And I thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Kevin. Is there anyone else who wants to testify?

(No audible response)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Well, I suggest we break for about 10 minutes then. Thank you.

21 (Off record at 4:20 p.m.)

(On record at 5:00 p.m.)

MS. GOTTLIEB: We'll reopen the hearing, and we have one more person who would like to testify. Paul?

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. PAUL HOHENLOHE

Okay. My name is Paul Hohenlohe. I work with the Wilderness Society, the Alaska Regional Office of the Wilderness Society, at least in our Anchorage office, focuses mostly on federal lands within the state, so that offshore oil leases are not normally in our field of attention. But we feel that this particular lease sale plan would have a serious impact on many federal areas, including several national wildlife refuges and national parks along the shoreline.

The impacts of oil development have been felt in other areas with the inevitable small oil spills and the cumulative effect on the adjacent ecosystem of those oil spills. Even the planning for this lease sale accepts that there will be some small oil spills associated with it. And we feel that this lease sale could have a detrimental effect on the ecosystems of the national wildlife refuges and national parks which are adjacent to the area.

So therefore, we have some serious reservations about this oil and gas lease sale.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. We appreciate you coming out this afternoon, and....

MR. HOHENLOHE: Okay.

MS. GOTTLIEB: ....thank you very much.

MR. HOHENLOHE: Thanks.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. We'll close. Thanks, Paul.

1	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-entitled
2	matter were adjourned at 5:10 p.m.)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	PAGI
3	Pam Miller	7
4		18
5		22
6	Denty Owens	24
7	Carl Hild	
8	Dorothy Childers	31
9	Tom Lakosh	35 43
10	Martha Levensaler	
11	David Harrison	44
12	George Matz	56
13	Robert Wolf	59
14	Terry Burrell	65
15	George Schmidt	69
16	Kevin Tabler	70
17	Paul Hohenlohe	74
18		
19		
20		
21		

22

23

24

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	STATE OF ALASKA
4	) ss. THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT )
5	
6	
7	I, CINDY S. CARL, do hereby certify:
8	(1) That the foregoing pages contain a full, true, and
9	correct transcript of proceedings in the above-entitled matter,
10	transcribed by me, or at my direction and supervision, to the
11	best of my knowledge and ability.
12	(2) That I have been certified for transcript services
13	by the United States Courts.
14	(3) That I was certified for transcript services by
15	the Alaska Court System prior to January 1, 1993.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	SIGNED AND CERTIFIED:
21	
22	
23	BY: Cindy S. Carl DATE: 3/21/95
24	Certified Court Reporter
25	William of the

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084



1	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
2	MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
3	
4	
5	
6	OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT
7	PUBLIC HEARING
8	COOK INLET SALE 149
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Kenai Merit Inn Kenai, Alaska
14	
15	Monday, March 6, 1995 7:00 o'clock p.m.
16	
17	
18	
19	MMS PANEL MEMBERS
20	Mr. Bob Brock Regional Supervisor, Leasing and Environment of the
21	Alaska OCS Region Mr. Barry Boudreau
22	Regional Supervisor for Field Operations Dr. Ray Emerson
23	DEIS Project Leader, Leasing and Environment Office
24	
25	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording. Transcript produced by transcription service.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

## KENAI, ALASKA - MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1995

(On record at 7:05 p.m.)

4 | (Tape No. 1 of 1)

MR. BROCK: Good evening, and welcome to the hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Federal Oil and Gas Lease Sale No. 149 in the Cook Inlet. The area that's discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement is shown on this map behind me. And I have a few comments to make before we get started with the public hearing.

My name is Bob Brock. I'm the Regional Supervisor for Leasing and Environment of the Alaska OCS Region of the Minerals Management Service in Anchorage. Other panel members include Mr. Barry Boudreau, who is the Regional Supervisor for Field Operations in Anchorage, and Mr. Ray Emerson, the Project Leader for this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

This is actually the third hearing on this proposal. We held a teleconference last Friday morning with the town of Seldovia, and then we held the Anchorage public hearing last Friday afternoon. Besides this one, there will be two more hearings, one in Homer tomorrow night and one in Kodiak the next night.

The purpose of the public hearings is to receive views and comments and suggestions of interested individuals and representatives of local government and organizations on

the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Draft Statement covers approximately 2 million acres which is being considered for leasing, or about 37 percent of the entire planning area. The major goal of this sale, in accordance with the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, is to find out more precisely what are domestic energy supplies are, where they are located, and allow them to be produced where it is possible to do so in an environmentally safe manner.

We have the responsibility to fulfill the mandates set out in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and its implementing regulations. In doing so, we strictly observe all of the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammals Protection Act, Coastal Zone Management Act, and the Oil Pollution Act. In addition, the Minerals Management Service has in place a host of regulations and operating rules that are designed to assure continued safe and clean offshore oil and gas activities. There are many additional safeguards that I won't go into detail today.

Discharges from oil and gas exploration and production activities will be subject to the Environmental Protection Agency's national pollution discharge elimination system, commonly referred to as NPDES permits. Under a local memorandum of agreement between MMS and the Environmental Protective Agency, MMS has agreed, on federal platforms, which are three

miles or further offshore, to conduct all the NPDES permit compliance inspections on OCS facilities in conjunction with normal drilling and production inspections.

Under this agreement, the MMS collects samples of discharges and provides them to EPA for independent analyses.

MMS has been conducting these compliance inspections in federal waters in Alaska since 1989. We are aware that EPA recently fined companies in upper Cook Inlet for violations of the permit conditions related to discharge that exceeded permit levels, mostly for sanitary and domestic waters (sic), but also for some oil and gas -- oil and grease discharges.

The MMS recently completed a water quality study in Cook Inlet which examined hydrocarbon concentrations in the water, sediments, and mussels and found no evidence of hydrocarbon contamination. The MMS study did not look for contaminants related to sanitary and domestic waters (sic). However, the study did perform sensitive life stage bioassays which indicated no harmful levels of contaminants in general. These study results are discussed in the Draft EIS, and the final report is available.

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement represents approximately three years of preparation, which included such actions as the call for information, area identification, and scoping. You have been a part of this process through your earlier comments, and are being asked once again to give us

your comments on this document. The Environmental Impact
Statement is a very important element in the discussion
process -- decision process. The law requires considerable
consultation with the Governor to balance national needs with
the well-being of local citizens.

We want everyone here to understand that MMS does not take this proposal lightly and that we approach all leasing decisions very cautiously and carefully. For example, as a result of the public input directly from people like yourselves, the MMS deleted a majority of the Shelikof Strait portion of the planning area, which included 358 blocks, or almost 2 million acres.

Also, the 149 Draft EIS contains mitigating measures for the first time that have been made part of the proposed action at this very early decision process, which was a suggestion made at previous public hearings right here in Alaska. There are also additional potential mitigating measures analyzed in the EIS.

Another example of our attempts to bring more responsive -- of being more responsive to public input is that concurrent with the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Sale 149, the proposed notice of sale is also available at this time for comment. In the past, the proposed notice of sale was provided after the release of the Final EIS. This time, it's released with the Draft, which would show how

the notice of sale would look based on the information in the Draft EIS.

I will call today's speakers in the order which they have registered, and if you wish to speak but have not already registered, please register with Dick Roberts, walking up this way. He's normally sitting back by the door. We have just a few rules I'd like you to follow to ensure that the public hearing runs smoothly.

Please state your name, address, and the organization or agency which you represent. We would like to have this information properly recorded in the transcript. And we'd like for you to hold your comments down to about 10 minutes or less. If you have prepared written testimony, please give a copy to the court reporter, sitting over here to my far right.

An official recorder will make a verbatim transcript of the hearing. Everything that is spoken during the hearing will be recorded. Copies of the transcript will be available through Mr. Robert Carl, who is our recorder, of Executary Court Reporting Services, and his phone number is area code (907) 272-4084.

The purpose of this hearing is to improve the quality of our Environmental Impact Statement before it is put in final form. Speakers will not be questioned unless a member of the panel wishes to clarify some information or obtain additional information. We are interested in understanding your views

about this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The comment period for this document closes on April 19th, 1995. Until that time, the MMS will accept comments and statements from anyone who would prefer to make a written comment rather than oral. These written comments and statements should be sent to our address, and Mr. Dick Roberts back there will be able to provide you with that if you see him on your way out. Remember, all comments have to be received by April 19th, 1995.

With that, I'd like to start our public hearing, and our first person is Mr. Mayor, Don Gilman.

(Pause)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MAYOR DON GILMAN

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, my name is Don Gilman, Box 2941, Kenai 99611, is my home address. My business address is 144 North Binkley Street, Soldotna 99669.

I'm Mayor of the Kenai Peninsula Borough, and tonight I will be speaking as the Mayor of the Borough.

We will be submitting to Minerals Management Service written comments, written analysis, of the Draft EIS, and we have a group of people that are working on that. And it will take us some time because that will go to our Planning Commission, and they will review it in a public meeting and approve the statement or the analysis that will be sent to MMS.

I'd like to thank you for the public process that has

taken place in both this Lease Sale 149 -- I think it's far improved from what we have had in the past. You have held a number of meetings, informational meetings, educational meetings, whatever you want to call them, throughout the Borough and in Kodiak for the last two years, that I'm aware of. Unfortunately, you did not have too many people attend those meetings, but nevertheless, there was a good deal of information disseminated and has been circulated throughout the community.

Sometime in the latter part of 1993 -- and I'm not sure, I don't have the documents in front of me this evening; I know you have them on file -- the Kenai Borough Assembly took a positive position on Lease Sale 149. And it was done in conjunction with and in tandem with the Kodiak Island Borough and the Lakin Peninsula Borough. I believe it was referred to as the Tri-Borough Position. And that position has not changed since that time. Essentially, it's a position that encourages the Lease Sale 149 to proceed provided that -- and I believe there were three comments, caveats, in the resolution.

One, that all areas of environmental sensitivity be identified in the -- or adjacent to sale areas through a scientific method, which you, in my opinion, have done in the EIS. Secondly, that there be no loading platforms allowed, and the stipulations very clearly that there be no offshore loading facilities be allowed in any development stage. And third,

that we encourage the MMS, Department of the Interior, to help the communities develop, with and through Congress, a method where the communities shared the resour- -- or the financial resources directly, rather than as it is now where the State receives some of the funds and the communities sometimes do and sometimes don't get a direct share of those proceeds.

Having attended the recent OCS Advisory Council meeting in Virginia last November, it is my opinion that that is being worked on, at the Congressional level as well as supported by the Department of Interior. So that -- whether that resolution had anything to do with that position or not, we'd like to think it did, but whether it did or not, I guess, is arguable. But that is one of the items that is being worked on.

I would prefer to let the public have their comments, so I won't take any more time. Again, I'd like to thank you for this process. We're -- as you know, we're moving -- doing a little different in the next five-year plan where there's a broadening of this public process into what's called a stake-holders' forum that will address lease sales of post- and -- pre- and post-lease sale with a broader forum type, which we encourage. We feel it's superior even to the process that you have used for Lease Sale 149.

So with that, unless there are some qualifying -- or questions that I can answer, I again thank you for coming to

the community. I know you're going to Homer tomorrow night,
Kodiak Wednesday, and I'm not sure where else.

MR. BOUDREAU: No questions.

MR. BROCK: Thank you, Mayor. It's always a pleasure to come to Kenai, and we really appreciate your -- working with you on this effort.

MAYOR GILMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Loren Flagg.

(Pause)

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY BY MR. LOREN FLAGG

Thank you for allowing this opportunity. My name is Loren Flagg. I represent the Kenai Peninsula Fishermen's Association. My address is Box 3268, Soldotna 99669.

Again, I really appreciate the public process that MMS/BLM has gone through. It's so much better than what we've experienced with the State in recent years, especially over Lease Sale 78, and we've certainly had full opportunity to participate.

I'm going to do a combination here of a quick read of very short comments that we already have on record, and then I'm going to ad lib a little.

The Kenai Peninsula Fishermen's Association is a group of over 400 commercial fishermen operating in the Cook

Inlet area, and they do have concerns with Lease Sale 149.

Part of the lease sale area being considered is in the heart of

the Cook Inlet salmon gillnet fishery, which takes place north of the latitude of Anchor Point. Also, parts of the proposed lease area between Kalgin Island and Cape Douglas are in areas that have been identified as hazardous to important or critical fish and wildlife resources by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

KPFA is concerned with leasing in these areas due to both the conflicts that will arise between commercial fishing and the oil industry operations and the high resource risks that are involved. If the decision is made to hold the sale, then we recommend these following stipulations:

That no seismic activity or drilling be permitted in the areas described above between May 1 and August 30. This restriction will help avoid physical conflicts within the fishing area and also reduce the risk of a fishing closure resulting from pollution caused by the oil industry. From strictly a biological standpoint, this proposed seasonal restriction is also justified. Critical life forms of commercially important fish and shellfish are present in high abundance in the marine waters of Cook Inlet during the May 1 through August 30 period.

If drilling does eventually take place on any of the tracts within the proposed lease sale, and development takes place, we would strongly encourage zero discharge. The zero discharge is now being used in the Gulf of Mexico in critical,

important areas, and we think the time has come for Cook Inlet.

Would it be appropriate for me to ask one question? Is that okay?

MR. BROCK: Yes.

BY MR. FLAGG (Resuming):

certainly can be done.

MR. FLAGG: In a nutshell, I was wondering why the Shelikof area was deleted from the sale. Was it because of the biological sensitivity or the commercial fishery in the area or....

MR. BROCK: The Secretary made that decision after a trip up, and I couldn't tell you all the reasons that went into it. I don't -- that was a decision by the Secretary.

Okay. Just a few other things. We think that technology now exists throughout the world to do it right, but that not all that technology has come to Cook Inlet. And that is the reason we're asking things like the zero discharge. It

No surface entry. Again, there are technologies that sub-sea wells can be utilized. You don't have to have platforms out there in the commercial fishing area. Sub-sea wells are used in other parts of the world.

Buried pipelines. Certainly if there are going to be pipelines, they can be, and should be, buried.

I think that's -- I'm trying to read here from my notes. I think that's the main points I wanted to make. There

was one final one that if production does eventually take place, if a find is made, that -- and I believe this is consistent with the Tri-Borough Resolution that the Mayor mentioned. I believe this was added to that, that during the transportation phase that a requirement be put in there that -- for tug escorts.

Right now we have no tugs in the Inlet that are capable of assisting a tanker, a laden tanker, in distress. If a tanker loses power or steering, there is absolutely no help within a reasonable time frame. It would have to come from Valdez. They have the only tractor tugs that would be -- have this kind of capability. So we'd ask that that requirement be put in, that if, in fact, as part of this, production take place from the sale.

Thank you very much.

MR. BROCK: Thank you, sir. Any questions?

MR. BOUDREAU: No questions.

MR. BROCK: Thank you, Loren.

MR. FLAGG: Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Mr. Matthews.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. THEO MATTHEWS

Good evening. My name's Theo Matthews. I reside at Mile 5.3 Kay Beach Road in Kasilof, Alaska; Box 69, Kasilof.

I'll be speaking tonight for two organizations. First, I'll be speaking as the Vice President of the United Fishermen of

Alaska. UFA is comprised of 21 regional fishing associations from Ketchikan through Bristol Bay. With respect to the affected fishing area that we're talking about tonight, we have members in Prince William Sound, lower and upper Cook Inlet, and Kodiak.

UFA opposes this sale in its entirety. The reason is simple and direct. A long discussion was held at our recent Board meeting in February. There was simply no rationale we could understand why the Shelikof Strait area was deleted due to fisheries -- sensitive fisheries areas and those other concerns, whereas the Cook Inlet area was maintained in the sale. Cook Inlet is every bit, if not more, fisheries sensitive as the same area.

Another reason that UFA opposes the sale in its entirety is that many of the affected resources from the Exxon Valdez oil spill are still in the recovering stage and have a long recovery to go. This includes not only the affected resources like sockeye salmon in Kodiak and Cook Inlet, but also our concerns about marine mammals, steller sea lions and whatnot on the Kenai Fjords.

So UFA's position is not one of opposing oil per se, it's that if Shelikof Strait was going to be deleted, there is no rationale for leaving in upper Cook Inlet. That was their Board -- that Board position.

Now I'd like to comment as Executive Director of

United Cook Inlet Drift Association. I also hold a commercial salmon drift permit myself. UCIDA appreciates the long process that you've set up for this. We have had a Board member, Mr. Bob Wolf, that's been working with the marine -- MMS for four or five years. And we really do understand the effort you've put in, and we've tried to reciprocate. So we appreciate that.

Our concerns with respect to the Federal Lease Sale 149 are very similar to the ones you've heard about the State Lease Sale 78. There is, in our opinion, a gross -- there's a major problem with the idea that you can attempt to minimize impacts to commercial fishing and, at the same time, prevent undue interference. I mean, you just cannot do it.

Our concern is for the stationing of a fixed platform on the fishing grounds. The mere stationing of that platform on the fishing grounds is undue interference. It cannot be mitigated. And that's the problem we have with this sale and others.

(As an aside) Is there something wrong?

Therefore, we've adopted the following position with respect to Sale 149, which is consistent with our position with the State Sale 78:

We feel that there should be no surface entry, i.e., no stationary production platforms. Production can be accommodated through bottom wells and pipelines to shore. I mean, we have discussed this technology with the industry.

Now, to get the oil to shore, you have to have a pipeline. Now, we really feel you must have a mitigation measure that requires buried pipelines. There is no alternative to this. For salmon fishermen, it's not such a big deal in terms of gear conflicts, but when you get into halibut and crab pots, whatnot, they simply could not cope with a pipeline above the surface. So it's needed from that point of view.

The other point is similar to the one referenced by Mr. Flagg. The oil industry in Cook Inlet is fighting the requirement for tug escort vessels. They're stipul- -- they simply state that, 'We don't need them; we can drop anchor. You know, if we lose power, we can drop anchor.' Well, I'd just submit to you that you drop anchor on a pipeline, and you've got problems. It better be buried and buried deep. And that's just common sense.

And the final concern that I'll mention deals with the liability question. Now, whether you have, as we would suggest, no surface entry, but a well on the bottom that's piped to shore, or if you have a platform, we have the liability question: What happens when you have a spill?

Now, with respect to commercial fishing, it's inevitable that a spill will happen; we have no doubt about it.

Your own document more or less says the same. It's also inevitable that if it happens at the wrong time, the quantity of oil is almost immaterial. Our commercial drift fishery will be

terminated, especially in the areas we're considering here.

So therefore, the question of liability is very vital to our membership. The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 has -- limits the liability of processors. It forces commercial fishermen to either elect to go through the federal process and give up access to courts or go through courts and give up access to the federal process.

So what I would suggest as a mitigation term is one that would require lessees -- since you know and I know that if a spill happens in the wrong time, your document states there will be loss of commercial fishing income, something similar to the voluntary Exxon Payment Program that we established should be a mitigation term. Producers should agree that in the event of a spill when commercial fishing time is lost, there will be a voluntary program that will send out rather rapid payments to allow people to continue with their lives -- to meet their boat payments and their permit payments.

I understand this is going a little afield, but this is the core of many concerns. A spill is inevitable; lost fishing income is inevitable. A mitigation term must take account to that.

And also, if there are production platforms on the ground, I mean, I assure you there is 100-percent certainty there will be gear conflicts, nets wrapped around the platform, fishing time lost. You also need a mitigation term to deal

with that. 1 I mean, I sincerely hope that the terms would require 2 no surface entry, buried pipelines, and if the industry can 3 cope with that, all these problems are resolved. I thank you 4 for the opportunity to comment. 5 MR. BROCK: I have one question, sir. 6 Sure. MR. MATTHEWS: 7 MR. BROCK: During -- no surface entry, in -- it's 8 you -- this is just for my own clarification. Does that mean 9 that no platform would be out there for drilling either? I can 10 understand what you mean by no platform out there.... 11 MR. MATTHEWS: Oh. 12 MR. BROCK: .....for sub-sea completion..... 13 14 MR. MATTHEWS: Certainly. MR. BROCK: ....but I'm having a hard time with.... 15 16 MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah. MR. BROCK: ....not -- I don't know where you could 17 18 drill from. I mean, I.... I appreciate the distinction. And we 19 MR. MATTHEWS: understand that exploration wells and all that will have to be 20 21 done. 22 MR. BROCK: Oh, okay. Okay. I under-.... MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah, this is a production..... 23 MR. BROCK: Oh, you're talking about a production 24

facility.

1 MR. MATTHEWS: Production sequence. 2 MR. BROCK: Okay. That's.... 3 MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah. We can -- there's no doubt we 4 can find times to accommodate exploration and all that.... 5 MR. BROCK: Okav. 6 MR. MATTHEWS: .....stuff. I mean, I don't have any 7 doubt about that. 8 MR. BOUDREAU: I have a question also, Mr. Matthews. 9 MR. MATTHEWS: Certainly. You were mentioning buried pipelines. 10 MR. BOUDREAU: 11 MR. MATTHEWS: Mm hmm (affirmative). Are you also recommending, in conjunc-12 MR. BOUDREAU: 13 tion with that, that all sub-sea wellheads be below the mud line? 14 Well, there, Mr. Chairman.... 15 MR. MATTHEWS: 16 MR. BOUDREAU: Or not? .....we did have a discussion with 17 MR. MATTHEWS: 18 some ARCO representatives on what was possible with respects to 19 sub-sea wells and pipelines. It was our understanding that they couldn't really do that. So you'd sort of have a singu-20 21 larity point that if you hit it, you'd be in trouble. But if 22 you didn't bury that pipeline, you've got 40, 50 miles of 23 trouble just waiting. I mean, that was my understanding. don't know if they could bury the actual wellhead. 24

don't know.

MR. BOUDREAU: Yeah, I was just trying to get some 1 2 clarification on.... Right. 3 MR. MATTHEWS: MR. BOUDREAU: .....your position on the sub-sea 4 wellhead completions versus the pipelines. 5 MR. MATTHEWS: Well.... 6 7 MR. BOUDREAU: Which you gave. Thank you. MR. MATTHEWS: Okay. And I quess -- if you'd permit 8 9 me, Mr. Chairman, I.... MR. BROCK: Sure. Go ahead. 10 11 BY MR. MATTHEWS (Resuming): 12 I failed to stress the importance of this geographic I mean, it's sort of south of Kalgin Island, runs down 13 to the heart of Cook Inlet, and this is the primary fishing 14 grounds of the commercial drift salmon fishery from Anchor 15 Point north. And the position UCIDA took that I didn't make 16 clear is no surface entry, no platforms north of there. 17 18 I mean, we're not the experts on the non-salmon fisheries south of there. 19 MR. BROCK: What was the line again? 20 The Anchor Point latitude..... 21 MR. MATTHEWS: 22 MR. BROCK: Anchor Point. .....is our southern boundary. 23 MR. MATTHEWS: 24 (Pause) MR. MATTHEWS: And that's all I had. 25

1	MR. BROCK: Any more questions?
2	(No audible response)
3	MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you.
4	MR. BROCK: Thank you, sir. We do appreciate those
5	comments.
6	(Pause)
7	MR. BROCK: Anybody else register, Dick?
8	MR. ROBERTS: Nobody else has registered to testify.
9	MR. BROCK: Is there anybody else here that would
10	like to testify that didn't register?
11	(No audible response)
12	MR. BROCK: Hearing none, I'll close the hearing at
13	this point in time. I will reopen again in 10 minutes in case
14	somebody comes in late. And if nobody comes in to testify in
15	10 minutes, I will close it for good. But I will recess, I
16	guess is the proper term here, for 10 minutes. Thank you.
17	(In recess)
18	(On record)
19	MR. BROCK: I'll reopen the public hearing. Just
20	is there anybody that came in that would like to testify?
21	(No audible response)
22	MR. BROCK: You want to okay. Could we we've
23	got one more person to testify, so, Ray, could you
24	(Pause)
25	MR. BROCK: Go ahead, sir.

### 1 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. KEN TURNAGE My name is Ken Turnage. I live in Kenai, Alaska. 2 3 Been here since April of '76. MR. BROCK: Could you spell your last name, please, 4 5 sir? MR. TURNAGE: 6 T-u-r-n-a-q-e. 7 COURT REPORTER: T-u-r what? 8 MR. TURNAGE: N-a-q-e. 9 COURT REPORTER: Okay. 10 BY MR. TURNAGE (Resuming): I work for VECO and have for -- since I've been in 11 I'm not here representing VECO tonight; I'm here 12 13 representing myself as an individual. 14 You know, I hear a lot of comments that lean towards 15 non-exploration and development, and that concerns me. One of 16 the reasons that concerns me is because, you know, my entire life does currently, and has always, revolved around the oil 17 18 industry. 19 Now, I understand that there's people in the oil 20 industry that may elect to ignore environmental precautions, you know, and the animals, destruction, fish, and what have 21 I'm not one of those, personally. 22

Also understand that there are environmentalists and other people in this world who, I don't care what you do, will never be satisfied that you've done enough. So there are both

2.3

24

ends of the extreme, you know, in this world, but I think that the majority of us fit somewhere in the middle. There has to be a balance in there, and I like to think that I'm in that balance.

You know, I heard several comments here tonight about dis- -- trying to discourage oil development. I heard comments about tug escorts and the risks of dragging anchors and hooking into those pipelines. The possibilities of that are so remote, as far as I'm concerned. And if you'd talk to the skippers out here, I think you'll find the same opinion, that, you know, it's almost an irrelevant, a moot issue, in my opinion.

I could walk out of this hotel tonight and get run over by a Mack truck. That's not to say that I'm going to spend the rest of my life in this hotel. I will walk out of here, and I will take that risk because there's a better world out there for me than there is in here, and I think we need to keep things in perspective.

You know, I hear talk about zero discharge. And let's face it: What we're talking is economics. We're talking state economics and the livelihood of 85 percent of the people in this state. And we start talking zero discharge, we're talking significant economic disadvantage.

You've just completed a study out here, several years and spent multi-millions of dollars doing studies that have indicated that what we've done out there thus far hasn't

created a significant problem. At the same time, I think you've discovered that the Cities of Soldotna, Anchorage, Kenai, and other municipalities have contributed significantly more waste products to the Cook Inlet than has the oil industry in the Cook Inlet.

Why is it the oil industry is held to such, as is suggested, that the oil and gas industry should stand as responsible as they are being asked to stand when the municipalities, fishing industry, tourist industry, you name it, has a much more lenient level of acceptance. Somewhere along the line, that doesn't make sense to me.

You know, we've done these studies; we've found out there's been no significant damage. Why don't we move on? You know, another reason, you know, that I feel we should move on is that we're discussing right now -- what we're discussing right now will allow for lease sales and ultimate exploration of the areas in question. Before development is allowed, there will be further studies done, public hearings, and what have you. What we need to do is get out there and find out what is where? We may be talking about moot issues. There may be zero oil in the primary fishing corridor that seems to be of significant concern.

And don't get me wrong. I'm not suggesting that, you know, the fishing industry and the environmentalists should not be recognized as viable interests. I'm not suggesting that at

1.3

all. What I'm saying is I think it can be worked out where it's viable for all parties.

But what we're talking about right now is not development and whether -- where the platforms are going to be or not be, whether it's going to be sub-sea completion and elevate the cost of production by 20 percent, 30 percent, 50 percent. What we're talking about right now is let's find out what is there. What is there to go after? Once we discover that and find out what's there, then we can talk about how can we develop this, this resource.

You know, all of us in this state benefit greatly from what the oil and gas industry has brought to this state. Every one of us. To my knowledge, I don't know one person in this state who hasn't benefitted from what the oil and gas industry have brought to this state. The infrastructure it's built, the facilities it's attracted, the people it's attracted, the K-Marts, the WalMarts, the McDonald's, the oil and gas supply stores up and down the street. We've all benefitted from it.

If we had to bring our fuel in from Seattle, could we be as lucrative in the fishing industry as we are today, or the oil industry as we are today? As workers, not owners. If I had to buy my gas for my car, or fuel for my truck, imported from Seattle, could I have the lifestyle that I enjoy today? I suggest not. Nor could anyone else in this state.

I think we need to move ahead, approve the explora-1 2 tion -- the lease sales and the exploration. There's going to be another opportunity, you know, to look at the development 3 4 stage and how we develop downstream. But let's find out what's Maybe we're fighting over nothing. But if there's 5 6 something there, maybe we can figure out how we can develop it so we can all continue to benefit. 7 8 Thank you. MR. BROCK: Thank you, sir. Any comments, any 9 10 questions? 11 MR. BOUDREAU: I have no questions. 12 MR. BROCK: Thank you. Appreciate it. Is there anybody else that would like to testify? 13 14 (No audible response) MR. BROCK: You got anybody else registered, Dick? 15 16 (No audible response) 17 MR. BROCK: Okay. With that, it's five after 8:00. 18 We'll close the public hearing here in Kenai. I want to thank 19 you all for attending. 20 21 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-entitled 22 matter were concluded at 8:05 p.m.) 23 24 25

1		TAE	BLE	OF	CO	NTE	ENTS	<u> </u>								
2	PUBLIC TESTIMONY															D3.67
3	Mayor Don Gilman .															PAGE
4									• •							7
	Loren Flagg				•		•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	10
5					•	• •	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	13
6	Ken Turnage	•	• •	•	•	• •	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	22
7																
8																
9																
10																
11																
12																
13																
14																
15																
16																
17																
18																
19																
20																
21																
22																
23																
24																
25																

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

### CERTIFICATION

SS.

That the foregoing pages contain a full, true, and

2

1

3

STATE OF ALASKA

THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

4

5

\_

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

correct transcript of proceedings in the above-entitled matter,

I, CINDY S. CARL, do hereby certify:

transcribed by me, or at my direction and supervision, to the best of my knowledge and ability.

- (2) That I have been certified for transcript services by the United States Courts.
- (3) That I was certified for transcript services by the Alaska Court System prior to January 1, 1993.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED:

Cindy S. Carl

cindy S. earl

Certified Court Reporter

DATE: 3/22/95



1	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
2	MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
3	
4	
5	
6	OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT
7	PUBLIC HEARING
8	COOK INLET SALE 149
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Homer High School Homer, Alaska
14	
15	Tuesday, March 7, 1995 7:00 o'clock p.m.
16	
17	
18	
19	MMS PANEL MEMBERS
20	Mr. Bob Brock Regional Supervisor, Leasing and Environment of the
21	Alaska OCS Region Mr. Barry Boudreau
22	Regional Supervisor for Field Operations Dr. Ray Emerson
23	DEIS Project Leader, Leasing and Environment Office
24	
25	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording. Transcript produced by transcription service.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

## HOMER, ALASKA - TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1995

3 | (On record at 7:05 p.m.)

4 | (Tape No. 1 of 5)

MR. BROCK: Could I have your attention a minute, please? Can you all hear me?

AUDIENCE RESPONSE: Yeah.

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Good afternoon, and welcome to the public hearing on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Oil and Gas Lease Sale No. 149 in the Cook Inlet. I want to thank you all for coming out today.

The reason we had to meet in the other building is the official announcement that we made publicly was to meet in the City Chambers, and so we had to meet there tonight. We did have this reserved just in case we had to move up here due to the crowd. We took that option and moved it from the City Chamber to here to the high school because of the crowd. And we appreciate your tolerance in coming with us, but due to the regulations, we did have to start the meeting there and then move it up here.

My name is Bob Brock. I am the Regional Supervisor for Leasing and Environment of the Alaska OCS Region of the Minerals Management Service in Anchorage. Our panel members include Mr. Barry Boudreau on my left, who is the Regional Supervisor for Field Operations of Minerals Management Service

in Anchorage, and Mr. Ray Emerson on my right, who is the Project Leader on this Environmental Impact Statement. I have a few comments here to set the stage, and then we will proceed right into the testimony.

This is the fourth public hearing on this particular EIS. We had a teleconference with Seldovia on -- last Friday. We had a public hearing in Anchorage last Friday. We had a public hearing in Kenai last night, and here tonight, and then we'll have a public hearing in Kodiak tomorrow night.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive views and comments and suggestions of you interested individuals, representatives of local government, and organizations on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This Draft Impact Statement covers approximately 2 million acres which are being considered for leasing, or about 37 percent of the planning unit that was originally considered.

The major goal of this sale, if it is held, in accordance with the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, is to find out precisely what our domestic energy supplies are, where they are located, and allow them to be produced where it is possible to do so in an environmentally safe manner.

We have the responsibility to fulfill the mandates set out in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and its implementing regulations. In doing so, we strictly observe all the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the

Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammals Protection Act,

Coastal Zone Management Act, and the Oil Pollution Act. In

addition, MMS has in its place -- has in place a host of regulations and operating rules that are designed to assure

continued safe and clean offshore oil and gas activities.

There are many additional safeguards that I won't go into

tonight.

Discharges from the OCS oil and gas exploration and production activities will be subject to the Environmental Protection Agency's national pollution discharge elimination system, which are commonly referred to as NPDES permits. Under a local memorandum of agreement between MMS and the Environmental Protective Agency, MMS has agreed, on federal platforms in federal waters, to conduct the NPDES permit compliance inspections on all offshore facilities in federal waters in conjunction with the normal drilling and production inspections.

Under this agreement, the MMS collects samples of discharges and provides them to EPA for independent analyses. The MMS has been conducting permit compliance inspections in federal waters in Alaska since 1989. We are aware that the EPA recently fined companies in upper Cook Inlet for violations of these permit conditions related to discharges that exceeded permit limits, mostly for sanitation — sanitary, rather, and domestic wastes, but also for oil and grease discharges.

The MMS recently completed a water quality study in

Cook Inlet which examined hydrocarbon concentrations in water, sediments, and mussels and found no evidence of hydrocarbon contamination. The MMS study did not look for contaminants related to sanitary and domestic waste. However, the study did perform sensitive life stage bioassays which indicated no harmful levels of contaminants in general. These study results are discussed in the Draft EIS, and the final report is down here at the local library. I just put it on file today. There — they have copies that can be checked out and reviewed of this final report on this study.

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement represents approximately three years of preparation, which included such actions as the call for information, area identification, and the scoping process. We have been — you have been a part of this process through your earlier comments and are being asked once again to give us your thoughts on the sale. The Environmental Impact Statement is a very important element in the decision process. The law requires considerable consultation with the Governor to balance national needs with the well-being of local citizens.

We want everyone to understand that the MMS does not take this proposal lightly and that we approach all leasing decisions very cautiously and carefully. For example, as a result of the public input, the MMS deleted a majority of the Shelikof Strait portion of the planning area. Also, the 149

Draft EIS contains mitigating measures that, for the first time, are being made part of the proposed action at this early phase of the decision process, which, I might add, was a suggestion made right here at public hearings in Alaska, and we adopted that approach.

Another example of our attempts to be more responsive to public input is that concurrent with the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed notice of sale is also available for comment. In the past, the proposed notice of sale was provided after the release of the Final Impact Statement. However, this time, the notice of sale appears as it would based on the information in the Draft EIS.

I will call today's speakers in the order which they have registered. If you wish to speak but have not already signed up to speak -- and what we did is we asked people to sign in and then put an asterisk by their name. However, I will guarantee you that I will -- we will stay right here until everybody here has had a chance to testify that wishes to testify. So if you didn't put an asterisk by your name, or if you have no signed in yet, or for some other reason you decide you want to testify, you don't have to worry, I will open the floor after I go through the people that have asked to testify and make sure that everybody that wants to gets a chance to testify.

If you decide that you would -- if you have written

comments and you don't wish to wait until your turn might come, we will take your written comments, and they will be put in the official record at this time. And I have a number of those up here with me.

We have a few rules that I would like to ask you.....

(Pause - Whispered consultation)

MR. BROCK: We have a few rules that I'd like to ask you to follow to ensure that the hearing runs smoothly.

Please state your name, address, and the organization or agency you represent. We would like to have this information properly recorded in the transcript. If comments -- and, please, if you could hold your comments to 10 minutes or less, that would be appreciated. If you have prepared written testimony, please give a copy to the court reporter for the official record. Now, you can -- if you decide that you don't want to read that or state that written testimony, we'll ju- -- like I said earlier, we'll just take the written testimony, and the recorder is sitting right over here to my right.

An official recorder will make a verbatim transcript of the hearing. Everything that is spoken when the hearing is in session will be recorded. So please remain as quiet as possible while the person is testifying. Copies of the transcript are available through Mr. Robert Carl, the person over here with the earphones on, of Executary Court Reporting Services. His telephone number is (907) 272-4084. That's (907)

272-4084.

The purpose of this hearing is to improve the quality of our Environmental Impact Statement before it is put in final form. Speakers will not be questioned unless a member of the panel wishes to have some facts clarified or obtain additional information. We are interested in understanding your views about this Environmental Impact Statement.

The comment period for this Impact Statement closes on April 19th, 1995. April 19th, 1995. Until that time, we will accept written comments and statements from anyone who would prefer to make a their written, rather than oral, comments. These written comments and statements, if not delivered here tonight, should be sent to our address, and you can obtain that address from Dick Roberts, who is --

Dick, raise your hand back there so people can see you if they -- raise both your hands.

Okay. That's Dick Roberts back there with the -- and if you want to get our address to send your comments in, or you can call me or Dick Roberts at (907) 271-6045 -- that's (907) 271-6045 -- if you don't have the address and would like to get that address. Again, let me emphasize that we will be taking written comments until Mar- -- or, I'm sorry -- until April 19th, 1995.

With that, I'm going to start the hearing, and we're going to take it in the order that they signed in. The first

1 one is Tanya Inga. (Pause) 2 3 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. TANYA INGA My name is Tanya Inga, and I'm from Homer. 4 5 My address is 991 Ocean Drive. MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Is the microphone 6 7 working? 8 MS. INGA: I hear it. MR. BROCK: Can you hear back there? 9 10 AUDIENCE COLLECTIVELY: (Pause - Whispered consultation) 11 Just talk right into this. Let's 12 MR. BROCK: Okay. 13 try it again. 14 MS. INGA: Can you hear me? 15 AUDIENCE COLLECTIVELY: Yeah. 16 MR. BROCK: Okav. 17 (Pause - Inaudible side comments) 18 BY MS. INGA (Resuming): 19 Again, my name is Tanya Inga. My address is 991 20 Ocean Drive Loop. I'd like to say a few words concerning the 21 lease. 22 I sure wish this meeting was to congratulate the oil 23 spill and gas industry on the fine job they have been doing, 24 but it's not. The truth of the matter is the oil companies 25 leak, dump, and spill millions of gallons of pollutants into

our water and air each year. Do we want that? Of course not. 1 2 Being born and raised in Alaska, I have been -- I have seen a lot of changes, especially on the Kenai Peninsula. 3 Upper Cook Inlet, at one time, was a very special place. 4 5 any more. High amounts of pollutants each year are turning Cook Inlet unusable. I don't want this for the Homer area. 6 7 The oil and gas industry are like cancers which spread and spread and kill everything in their path. 8 again, I say no to the Oil and Gas Lease Sale 149. 9 MR. BROCK: Can you just lay it down there maybe? 10 11 And then we.... 12 (Applause) 13 MR. BROCK: Thank you. Mary Ann Hutkins (sic)? 14 (No audible response) 15 MR. BROCK: I can't read the way the..... 16 (Pause - Side comments) MS. HOLTHAUS: Holthaus. Holthaus. Holthaus. 17 MR. BROCK: Oh, Holthaus. Okay. 18 19 DR. EMERSON: Holthaus. 20 MS. HOLTHAUS: Yeah. MR. BOUDREAU: Could you spell that? 21 MR. BROCK: Would you please spell it? 22 23 MS. HOLTHAUS: H-o- --24 MR. BROCK: Can you pick up the mikes there so 25 that....

MS. HOLTHAUS: Mm hmm (affirmative).

MR. BROCK: ....we can hear you, please?

2.2

MS. HOLTHAUS: H-o-l-t-h-a-u-s. Do you have it?

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MARY ANN HOLTHAUS

I represent -- yeah. And I represent my grand-children. They're fishing people, and I want fish to be here for them to benefit from in years to come. And I've watch the salmon disappear from the West Coast around Seattle and all along there, and I don't want to see this happen here. This is a very special place, and we want to protect it for people and animals, birds, and the fish. And the fish, not the oil, I don't think.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Paul Seaton.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. PAUL SEATON

Thank you. My name is Paul Seaton, 58360 Bruce

Drive, Homer. I'm a commercial fisherman, and I'm here representing myself. I have two chief concerns about Lease Sale

149. And the first is oil spills, it's effect on the environment and also on the people.

In your EIS Table 11.1-1, your Alternative No. 1, your base case, says that there's a 27-percent chance of greater than a thousand-barrel oil spill. Although the Environmental Impact Statement labels this as a relatively low

chance, this is clearly an unacceptable chance to myself and the people here in Homer.

I'd also like to say that discharge of drilling muds, in the Lower 48 these discharges are not permitted. I don't want to debate the toxicity of these drilling muds, but these are areas of crab and bottomfish fishing grounds, and there should be no discharge of the drilling muds in Alaskan waters.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Barbara McNinch.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. BARBARA MCNINCH

My name is Barbara McNinch, and my address is 56990 Bradley Lane in Homer.

I'm here to tell you to cancel the lower Cook Inlet Lease Sale 149. Our economy and way of life are tied to our natural resources, and these are the same resources which will be seriously threatened by this lease sale.

The probability of minor spills and/or major spills are risks that we are unable to take. We need to protect our families, our fisheries, the wildlife refuges, parks, preserves, and critical habitat areas that border this lease sale.

Let's turn our focus away from the oil industry and toward alternative energy to fill our nation's energy needs.

Say no to Lease Sale 149.

(Applause)

1 MR. BROCK: Thank you. Elasha (sic) McLean. Did I 2 pronounce that right? 3 It's Lhasha. MS. McLEAN: 4 MR. BROCK: Lhasha? 5 MS. McLEAN: Yes. Do I have to pick this up? 6 MR. BROCK: Yes. I don't think we can hear you if we 7 don't. 8 FROM THE AUDIENCE: We can't hear you. 9 MR. BROCK: Okay. Thank you. 10 MS. McLEAN: Okay. 11 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. LHASHA MCLEAN 12 My name is Lhasha McLean, and I live at 56990 Bradley 13 Lane. 14 They said that they were planning to drill 2 million 15 I definitely don't believe that it should be 2 million 16 acres because from the drilling and all the drilling mud, you 17 know how many fish that will kill? And I know a lot of people 18 whose parents are fishermen. 19 And in the Shelikof Straits, I know that it's like 20 really choppy water and really strong currents. How do you 21 know -- how do we know that they can handle drilling and all 22 the big ships in the choppy water? There's probably going to 23 be an oil spill, and they probably don't have the equipment to 24 stop it fast.

And in Katmai, if there is an oil spill, probably the

oil will move down to Katmai and kill a lot of fish. And that 1 will kill the bears because I know there's a lot of bears And I don't think that anybody really wants all the 4 bears to disappear. And more people will move here. I think the schools And, I mean, I don't want to will probably get really big. live here if it's like going to be a city because I like it just the way it is. And....

# (Applause)

And it says that there's going to be a 72-percent chance that there is an oil spill. I don't think that we want to take that chance. It's too high. Please say no to Lease Sale 149. Thank you.

### (Applause)

Thank you very much. David Paxton. MR. BROCK: (Pause - Audience comments)

MR. PAXTON: Which mike? This one?

Just pick up the two if you can. MR. BROCK: you go.

> MR. PAXTON: Oh. Hello, Bob. Thanks for coming.

Thank you. MR. BROCK:

Okay. And I want to thank Homer for MR. PAXTON: This is great. It's the best turnout I've ever coming, too. Thank you. seen.

(Applause)

**Executary Court Reporting** 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DAVID PAXTON

I'm going to make this short but sweet. Number one, I'm in opposition to this oil lease sale. But I want to give the reasons. And I'm not trying to slam anybody or do that. My affiliation is with the Alaska Volcano Observatory. I'm here for myself, my family, and the community I live with.

My main concern is that in your document, 38.2, there's only one paragraph, paragraph 3, "Volcanism." What we need here is that we have no contingency plan whatsoever for a catastrophic event in this Environmental Impact Statement. In other words, you say a contingency plan. We are sitting on a cluster of volcanoes here in the bay, in a subduction (ph) zone, and I won't bore you with the geology with that.

But -- and this plan does not address, number one, that if drilling rigs are to -- or exploration rigs are to be moved in, there are no hydraulic shutoff valves whatsoever on the surface floor. Number two, all the oil, you know, all the dock terminals should be placed above the 100-foot line, period. And I'll get into that in just a second. And number three, like I say, there's absolutely no contingency plan.

I do know that NASA does overlook this cluster of volcanoes, and we look at them real close. But what we have here is a very volatile situation, is that it's seismically very unstable. These people here on the ecosystem are ecologically very sensitive and unstable, too, 'cause they live out of

these tide pools.

2

1

# (Laughter)

3

BY MR. PAXTON (Resuming):

4 5

Augustine going off, or one of these clusters going We all do. off, is a catastrophic event in itself.

6

7

But here, as we've heard the last two months, we don't have enough money for tractor tugs, for tankers. We don't have money for tra- -- for tugs for these vessels, and

8

we don't have an early warning system on the volcanoes.

9 10

And I believe Yergen Keenley (ph) with the Alaska need that.

11

Volcano Observatory, we're ongoing, we're trying to install

12

that.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

The industry, if it is to drill, here's how I feel personally: You can drill it. You can drill it. We need to know what's there. I'm tired. I want to lay it to rest. That doesn't mean we can go into production. want to know. Let's take Alternative 2 or just nothing yet because what we have, is I see underground pipelines there. I am an engineer, and they go underneath the bay.

These are synclines, anticlines; the lines contract and expand. If we are to install these oil lines, they need to be double-wall with the back air compressor going back through the line. Any deviation in pressure, shut it down.

These are my concerns, and thank you for listening to

me.

2 |

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Remember, if you haven't signed in, I'd just like to remind you one more time. Dick, raise your hand back there so they can see you. He's the guy with the white paper in his hand there. Please do go back and -- or please do go over by him and sign in if you have not done that yet.

(Applause)

The next testifier is Marla McPherson.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MARLA MCPHERSON

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{My}}$$  name is Marla McPherson, and I live at 61935 Race Road, Homer.

I oppose Lease Sale 149. I believe that oil and gas exploration is a wasteful investment. The reason why I believe this is because a lot of people say that it will provide our economy with a boost, but all that it does is provide us a boom/bust economy. We've seen already with the North Slope that the oil is running out, and as the pipeline runs dry, these people are in a panic. They don't know what they're going to do -- we don't know what we're going to do about our economy.

Our legislators are having to cut the budget right across the board because our state is running out of this money. And if we go back and invest in oil, which they seem to think is the answer, the process is going to happen again.

This cycle is going to happen again, and it will be a constant cycle of boom and bust. And I don't believe that oil is the answer because it's a short-term solution.

It's a non-renewable resource, and it's guaranteed to run out, and when it does run out, Alaskans will have nothing to show for the oil industry. All we'll have to show is polluted air, toxic waters, depleted fish and wildlife populations, and the world's longest pipeline. I don't want this to be what Alaska stands for.

Americans should be beyond their oil dependency, and by promoting the oil development, we are prolonging our dependency. Our future depends upon our renewable resources, such as the fishing, sport fishing, commercial fishing, and the tourism. And the oil development is mutually exclusive with these industries.

My family is here tonight, and I know that they probably can't stay to speak because my two-year-old nephew needs to get home and go to bed, but they run Seekins Bed and Breakfast here in Homer. And I know that if we have oil, there's a big chance that we -- that the fish populations will go down because of pollutants. And with no fish, we'll have no tourists and no jobs, and this community depends upon the fishing and the tourist industry. This is our livelihood, and we can't support an issue that is mutually exclusive with this livelihood.

We need an economy that we can trust in, that gives us security, and that is dependable. And we're not willing to sacrifice our environment. Even if this oil lease promised us all the wealth in the world, this land is priceless and it's not for sale. You can't buy untainted waters, can't buy clean air, and can't buy the pristine biodiversity of the lower Cook Inlet. Thank you.

### (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Jeff Wraley, W-r-a-l-e-y. W-r-a- -- I believe it is, W-r-a-l-e-y? Jeff?

## (Pause)

MR. WRALEY: My name's Jeff Wraley.

MR. BROCK: Can you pick up the mikes?

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. JEFF WRALEY

My name is Jeff Wraley. I live in the Homer vicinity, on Skyline Drive. My P.O. Box number is 844 Homer, and
I'm a local citizen speaking for myself. I'd like to thank you
for this opportunity to speak.

I've had opportunity to inspect both large volumes of data and statistics covering Lease Sale 149. Though I think the document is unnecessarily ponderous for an EIS to inform the general public and could be summarized more effectively as to the pros and cons of oil development, I would still like to thank the authors of this environmental assessment for a fair degree of forthrightness and honesty in pointing out for the

public many of the glaring shortcomings and dangers of Lease Sale 149.

To start with, I'm opposed to Lease Sale 149 or any future sales in Cook Inlet. Many people of the Cook Inlet region still vividly remember the devastating Exxon Valdez oil spill, and I, for one, don't care to see history repeated here in Cook Inlet. OSRA has estimated an 87-percent chance for two spills over 1,000 barrels occurring in the cumulative case scenario. Your own document shows attempts at mitigation were proven ineffective after a large spill. This is unacceptable risk and a direct threat to the real lifeblood of our area.

At present, the only real long-term sustainable economies in Cook Inlet are fishing and tourism. Oil development comes then is gone after a few decades, leaving those residents with a long-term stake in the area left holding the bag of pollution and disrupted communities.

Your Lease Sale 149 is not going to improve my quality of life. Mine's just fine as it is. It is going to make a few outsiders very wealthy, and your own figures prove that out. You've admitted that of the 1,400 or so jobs generated by the sale, most will go to outsiders and few to residents. Your sale will just drive up our taxes and the cost of living.

Now, change and growth will come to Cook Inlet with or without oil development, but we, the people, do have a legal

1 right to determine what form change and growth take and control 2 it for the greater good rather than.... 3 (Off record) 4 (Tape Change - Tape No. 2 of 5) 5 (On record) 6 (Applause) 7 BY MR. WRALEY (Continuing): 8 Minerals Management should get the message. people of the lower Cook Inlet have, over the last two decades,

thrown out past attempts at oil lease sales. We're getting tired of repeating ourselves. We'd rather be out on the Inlet fishing or ferrying tourists than sitting in here fighting

Right now the EPA is charging the existing Cook Inlet oil drillers with over 800 violations of the Clean Water Act. With this track record, you can't expect us to trust the oil industry, and we don't. Without EPA presence constantly looking over the shoulder of the oil industry, company promises to live up to environmental standards might as well be written in smoke. As things stand, EPA enforcement is inadequate, and there should be greater regulation pushing for zero emission of pollutants in Cook Inlet.

(Applause)

In this and future lease sales, I want to see more coordination between agencies that have jurisdiction in Cook

**Executary Court Reporting** 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lease sales.

Inlet rather than the present system that forces the public to approach agencies separately when seeking information and offering suggestions and testimony. I especially would like to see the Coast Guard more involved in offering advice on the need for tanker escort tugs suitable for the currents and ice conditions in these waters. As things stand, they do not exist now.

### (Applause)

Another disturbing element of this lease sale is the failure to quantify the long-term and chronic impacts of this oil lease on Cook Inlet waters and everything that lives in or around it. Long-term effects to wildlife, to me, are nowhere to be found in this document. I find it a rather remarkable leap of faith to say since no one has looked for long-term problems, we should assume none are there. Is this a case of out of sight, out of mind, or just the blind leading the blind?

Before my -- before any oil leases are considered, I want to see hard answers to the question of long-term effects. With five wildlife refuges bordering the lease sale, a booming tourist industry, and hundreds of millions of dollars in commercial and sport fisheries at stake, this oil lease, if it goes through, could cost us far more than whatever sum it generates over the few decades of its life. For persons with a long-term stake in this area, this issue is not only personal but one that will affect their children and their children's

children.

This country is not desperate for Cook Inlet oil.

This is not a case of national security. We are nationally involved in an orgy of consumption for the sake of consumption.

(Applause)

I don't feel obliged to subsidize the wasteful attitudes of some Americans and allow a few special interest oil drillers to dictate the fate of Cook Inlet as if it were a Third World colonial state.

# (Applause)

Alaska shouldn't be sacrificed while Lower 48 states, who are the main consumer of our oil, refuse their own oil lease sales because they don't want to see oil on their beaches. The oil industry simply wants to take Alaska's riches for itself. I want assurances, and until I get some, I can believe -- I can't believe in this. I must conclude that oil derricks in lower Cook Inlet is something I can live without. The cost of doing business is just too high. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: John Bushell.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. JOHN BUSHELL

Hi. Thanks for being here. My name is John Bushell. My address is 534 West Cowls (ph) in Homer, and I'm representing myself.

I want to thank you for coming to Homer and listening to our concerns about the waters that we all live alongside. Tonight you will be hearing the thoughts of many residents of this area. It is my hope that you have come here tonight with an open mind. I hope your mind is not made up. I hope that you can listen to all of tonight's testimony and dwell on it for a while. Then your heart will know what is the right thing to do.

Tonight you are not hearing from an irate, irrational group of people. This room is not full of special interest specialists. You are hearing from teachers, students, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, probably some Greens out there, too, kids, senior citizens, politicians, and many more. I hope you listen to every one of us. Don't sit back for a moment and say to yourself, 'Only a few more to go.' Please remember that all these people, along with myself, live here, and that our opinion is important to us and, hopefully, to you.

I don't need to say, 'No oil in our waters.' I've got friends behind me that will say it loud and clear. I just ask that you listen to them. The decision you make regarding the southern area of Cook Inlet affects every single one of us. We live here, work here, and raise our families here. We all marvel at the beauty of our mountains and our waters. I don't want to worry that the scenery might change.

Please, listen to my friends and neighbors with an

open mind, and make your decision after you've had time to 1 think about all you hear tonight. Thank you. 2 (Applause) 3 Thank you. And we definitely will. Gail 4 MR. BROCK: Parsons. 5 (Pause) 6 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. GAIL PARSONS 7 I'm not sure everyone's seen these, but this is the 8 9 document we're talking about. MR. BROCK: Can you pick up the mike? You need three 10 11 hands. MS. PARSONS: I need three. 12 13 BY MS. PARSONS (Resuming): My name is Gail Parsons. 14 Thank you. Can you hear, Bob? 15 MR. BROCK: (No audible response) 16 BY MS. PARSONS (Resuming): 17 18 My address is Post Office Box 2397 in Homer. Here in this -- these sale proposal document is the 19 federal government's latest plan to risk a healthy, sustain-20 able, natural ecosystem in favor of big oil. The other natural 21 resources in this area need to take precedence, especially in 22 23 the light of the need for continued restoration from the Exxon 24 Valdez spill. Nowhere in this DIS do I find reasonable justifica-25

tion to put the lives of thousands of citizens and billions of inter-dependent organisms at risk for what are described as possible economic benefits. The long-term economic effects are truly detrimental to the quality of life here.

Some of them are an influx of workers from Louisiana, Texas, California, that the industry imports, causing stress on the costs to city infrastructure with very little relative income and few, if any, jobs for local residents. This creates a boom/bust economy, not a sustainable one.

Also, an industrialization of a small, rural population that has chosen to live at the end of the road precisely because it does not have, and does not want, the problems associated with big industry. Also, the costly environmental nightmares that come with this are well documented in the toxic sites in the Kenai area, in the at least 800 violations of clean water and air charged against industry by the EPA, and in the mandated fund that was supposed to be used to restore the North Slope ecosystem. If that fund exists -- and I have been able to establish that it even exists (sic) -- it has fallen far short of its mandate.

This is an example of how well the oil industry and government, both state and federal, work together. They promise the sky, as they did in Prudhoe Bay, saying, 'We'll take all of this away. We'll leave a pristine environment,' and then say after that it's -- after it's damaged that it isn't

economically feasible to restore it. Well, that isn't good enough for me.

What is at stake here is too precious. Thousands of people's lives and quality of life would be pushed aside so that the oil industry could drill risky exploration wells in this valuable ecosystem still stressed by the '89 spill. As of this moment, five years after, recommendations were made to protect Alaskan waters, we don't even have the safeguards in place in Cook Inlet that now exist in Prince William Sound in spite of a worse weather, docking, and traffic scenario here.

As I read through the DIS, I am impressed by page after page of analysis and projection. Hundreds and hundreds of hours of work are accumulated in this document, and many days have been dedicated to meetings like this, and all of us appreciate your efforts. We come tonight to respond.

The risks outlined in your document are far too high for me. The few months of oil production forecast by the scientists are not of value great enough to justify the fear and inevitable degradation that you promise and we believe from past experiences with the oil industry, that the cost to the communities and creatures of lower Cook Inlet will be much greater than what you predict.

For instance, in Volume 2, you give an analysis of a 200,000-barrel oil spill. The projection may be accurate for the scenario you have chosen in the month of April, but why

April? This could happen any month, and a much more sensitive month would change these figures dramatically.

There's a tiny section of this DIS that addresses alternative energy -- a few pages. It is my hope that the next time I see one of these documents, the large part will be alternative energies, and a few tiny pages, if any, will deal with oil.

Today in the Lower 48, cost of solar power has been reduced to 5 cents per kilowatt hour, and wind generation costs have been reduced to 9 cents. My HEA bill that I looked at today charges me between 10 and 11 cents per kilowatt hour based on fossil fuel.

What is already happening in Cook Inlet regarding drilling and transportation of toxins gives us more risk than we should bear. Do not further jeopardize our lives by pursuing this lease sale. Take heed of your warnings of impending losses, and choose on the side of caution and health. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Joel Cooper?

(Pause - Whispered comments)

MR. COOPER: Let's try it. That work?

MR. BROCK: Yeah. I think you'll have to lean clear over there though.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

## (Pause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. JOEL COOPER

My name is Joel Cooper. My address is at the end of Saltwater Drive. My mailing address is P.O. Box 3585, Homer. I'm here representing myself.

First, I'd like to thank all the people at MMS and the Department of Interior, who put so much time and energy into putting this Draft EIS together. It is quite an accomplishment. I would also like to thank MMS and the Interior Department for the opportunity to comment on the EIS and Lease Sale 149.

I am very discouraged that Secretary Babbitt is not here to hear the testimonies of myself and people of this community and the communities of Cook Inlet. I believe that the person that is going to make the final decision on a project of this magnitude that will have unavoidable adverse effects and that has high probabilities, be it 27 percent, 64 percent, 72 percent, or 87 percent, of an oil spill or spills, that can have significant adverse effects on a humane, marine, and coastal environment should be present at the hearings of the communities that will be affected.

As a scientist who has spent two years studying the sea bird colonies in the Barren Islands, partook in winter survey to determine population estimates of marine birds on lower Cook Inlet and Kachemak Bay, conducted shore bird (indis-

cernible) in the mud flats of Tuxedni Bay, worked on Tustumena Lake salmon study to determine spawning distribution of adult sockeye and chinook salmon, and have spent three years as an environmental chemist analyzing hydrocarbon and hydrocarbonderived pollutants, I am opposed to Oil Lease Sale 149. This is to say I'm in favor of Alternative 2, the no-lease sale alternative.

As a citizen of the community of Homer and the Cook
Inlet region who utilizes the marine plants, invertebrates, and
fish resources as a source of food, and also one who values the
pristine beauty of Cook Inlet and Kachemak Bay, I also support
Alternative 2, the no-lease sale alternative.

I have spent many hours, actually days, reading and analyzing this Draft EIS, days that I would have rather spent working, camping, skiing, and socializing, without the weight of this two-volume EIS. I plan to spend many more days up to the April 19th deadline, and beyond, to give the best possible comment. I've begun a list of very important questions that I would like to be considered. And I will have a larger list by the time April 19th rolls around.

I'm very unclear about the laws and regulations that MMS must follow. I know that the EIS provides summaries of Acts, as amended, related statutes, and summaries of the requirements for exploration and development and production activities. But I've decided that since I'm living in a commu-

nity that has -- that can have OS -- OCS development, I figure I'd better know the laws in their entirety so I can better understand how OCS development takes place, and so I can understand whether the development is being carried out according to the law. Or so I'm asking -- so I'm asking MMS to provide or direct me to where I can obtain these laws in their entirety.

My question is in rega- -- I have a question in regarding (sic) Alternative 2. I know that this alternative would be tantamount to cancellation of Sale 149, and should this sale not be held, the energy that would have flowed into the U.S. economy for resources leased under this sale would need to be provided by substitute sources, as stated on page 2-4, Volume 1. What I would like to know is why equal or more attention was not given to possible substitutes for the resources expected to be produced as a result of the proposed action.

It seems to be rather obvious that more resources could be available through conservation in the transportation sector since the transportation sector consumes over 40 percent of the petroleum products sold in the U.S., as stated in Volume 2, Appendix D, page D-3. This is only one aspect of conservation, and only one energy alternative to the proposed action. I don't think the eight pages in Appendix D is adequate at all in addressing energy alternatives that would meet the national energy demand, the purpose of the proposed action, as stated on

page 1-1, Volume 1.

Alternatives that would have less of an impact and would protect the humane, marine, coastal environments considered in the proposed actions. Alternative energies that would have flowed into the U.S. economy if alternatives were not adequately considered or not considered at all.

I would like -- I'd like to also address the time allowed to review this document and the technical nature of the document. It is obvious that the general public does not have the time and are overwhelmed by the size and the scientific nature of this EIS, and that they cannot comment on it in a way that MMS sees applicable to the EIS. I think it should be the responsibility of MMS to see to it that everyone in the public sector of the proposed area is contacted and explained in a comprehensible and understandable way how they are going to be affected by the proposed action.

#### (Applause)

I ran out of time. That's all I could write down and with a well thought out thing. So I wrote some little notes that I want to comment on.

One is that it's blatantly obvious oil should not be developed in Cook Inlet. The industry is having an impact in the upper Inlet right now. Industry has to start developing an ethic where they have no discharge of pollutants at all.

I'd also want to address the fact of how this EIS

will be addressed if the export ban is lifted, as I'm hearing in the media. If the export ban is lifted, then the need to meet the energy demand for this country will be at odds with exporting the oil that will be sent overseas. Therefore, it won't be meeting the energy demand of this country, but it will be meeting the energy demand of other countries. And that is at direct odds with the purpose of this EIS.

It also -- oop. Sorry about that. I would also like to comment on the psychological effects that have been forced upon me, and I'm sure the people of this community, in having to worry about the high probabilities of an oil spill.

I would also like to comment that the view of the oil rigs is unavoidable, and that is something that will be incompatible with the economy of Homer since it is a tourist-based economy as well as a fishing economy.

And I'd also like to refer to the socioeconomics page on 3-C.10, and I'd like to read what was written here 'cause I think it is well said about Homer. It says,

"In the Homer area, in contrast, the Homer area is more sparsely populated, and it has not been subject to the major economic fluctuations that have characterized the development of Kenai/Soldotna area. Furthermore, the Homer area is economically dependent on commercial fishing and tourism rather than the oil and gas industry.

Social[ly] diverse with a wide variety of lifestyles and ways of life, the Homer area has
shown considerable social/cultural continuity
and stability despite rapid population growth.
This is attributed to the strong ties residents
have developed to maintain a local natural environment.

"Newcomers arriving in the area for various reasons have adapted to the three basic ecological economic niches the Homer area provides: commercial fishing, trade, and semi-subsistence fishing and farming. All value their independence, and many are seeking to establish self-sufficient, self-reliant ways of life."

This is why I live in Homer, and I don't want this changed into an oil industry economy.

#### (Applause)

And finally, I'd like to close my testimony with the ending of an essay by Wendell Barry (ph) called "Word and Flesh," from his collection of essays, "What Are People For?" He concludes:

"Our most serious problem, perhaps, is that we have become a nation of fantasists. We believe, apparently, in the infinite availability of finite resources. We persist in land

Ø

use methods that reduce the potential infinite power of soil fertility to a finite quantity, which we then proceed to waste as if it were an infinite quantity.

"We have an economy that depends not on the quality and quantity of necessary goods and services, but on the moods of a few stockbrokers. We believe that democratic freedom can be preserved by people ignorant of the history of democracy and indifferent to the responsibilities of freedom.

"Our leaders have been, for many years, oblivious to the realities and dangers of their time, as were George III and Lord North. They believe that the difference between war and peace is still the overriding political difference when, in fact, the difference has diminished to the point of insignificance.

"How would you describe the difference between modern war and modern industry, between, say, bombing and strip mining, or between chemical warfare and chemical manufacturing? The difference seems to be only that in war, the victimization of humans is directly intentional, and in industry, it is accepted as a tradeoff.

Were the catastrophes of Love Canal, Bhopal, Chernobyl, and the Exxon Valdez episodes of war or of peace? They were, in fact, peace-time acts of aggression, intentional to the extent that the risks were known and ignored.

"We are involved unrelentingly in a war not against foreign enemies but against the world, against our freedom, and indeed, against our existence. Our so-called industrial accidents should be looked upon as revenges of nature. We forget, nature is necessarily party to all our enterprises, and she imposes conditions of her Now she is plainly saying to us, 'If you put the fates of whole communities or cities or regions or ecosystems at risk in single ships or factories or power plants, then I will furnish the drunk or the fool or the imbecile who will make the small necessary mistake."

Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

Charles Davis is next, with Horse Trader MR. BROCK: following.

While he's walking up, I do have -- and I will periodically turn these in to the record. We have turned in a

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

letter tonight signed by 37 high school students that are opposing the sale, and that will go into the official record.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: And there's also a written note here from Annette B-e-l-l-a-m-y, I believe it is.

COLLECTIVE RESPONSE: Bellamy.

MR. BROCK: Bellamy? That also will go into the official record.

(Applause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CHARLES DAVIS

Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to come here and talk. My name is Charles Davis. My address is Box 906 in Homer. I live down on the beach. We've had oil on that beach already once; it's not pleasant.

I come from a family of oil people. I've been around the oil business for over 50 years. If you people insist on leasing this land and allowing these oil companies to drill, they will spill the oil. And it shouldn't happen.

It is a matter of national security though. You know, this oil is very necessary for certain things in our society. This oil is going to be needed for our great great great grandchildren. What is the plan, when you get all this oil drilled up and produced, what are we going to do for oil then? We're going to be at the mercy of who? The Saudi Arabians? The Russians? The Chinese? Where is the consider-

ation of what your grandchildren are going to do, or your great grandchildren.

I asked before -- I think I've testified two or three times before you folks. I've asked you, What's the big rush to privatize a public domain resource? Why don't we wait until the price of oil is a hundred dollars a barrel? There'll be enough money to afford the necessary systems so to produce this oil without spilling any of it, in much the same way that steel is made in mills today, in modern mills today, where there is no pollutants that escape into the atmosphere whatsoever, where everything is recycled. Why are we in such a big rush right now to lease all this land out?

You know, if you want to find out what's out there, you can do a pretty good job through your geological surveys. I don't see why we even have to drill a test well. There's plenty of places in America; for instance, you can go down off the coast of California. There's plenty of places to drill down off the coast of California right now that they aren't drilling.

Around here in Homer, we call this the halibut capital of the world, the halibut sport fishing capital of the world. Well, when I was a young man about 14 years old, Ocean-side, California, was the halibut sport capital of the world. But they were drilling for oil, and there is no halibut down there any more.

б

So I am against this sale. The speakers here tonight 1 before me and the ones that'll come after me are a lot more 2 eloguent about expressing all of the things that are wrong with 3 this, and those that have read the EIS. I haven't read the 4 5 EIS. But I would certainly wish that someone would answer to us why we have to do this now. Thank you. 6 7 (Applause) MR. BROCK: Horse Trader, followed by Daniel Zate, 8 9 Z-a-t-e (sic). 10 MR. ZATZ: Zatz. 11 MR. BROCK: Zatz? PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MICHAEL WHITE, a/k/a HORSE TRADER 12 Hey, there's been a lot of good things said here 13 tonight -- and there's a lot more. Looks like the turnout 14 alone has shown that there's a lot of support here. 15 My name's Horse Trader. I live up on Raven Ridge. 16 17 My box is 2626..... Sir, excuse me. What -- could you give MR. BROCK: 18 19 us your name so we..... MR. WHITE: Oh, yeah, sure. Well, my real name is --20 well, my real name's Horse Trader, too. I -- but my name's 21 Michael White, alias Horse Trader. We'll go that way. 22 23 MR. BROCK: White, did you say? 24 MR. WHITE: White, yeah. 25 MR. BROCK: How do you spell it?

MR. WHITE: Like the color, white.

MR. BROCK: W-h-i-t-e?

MR. WHITE: Yeah. That's it.

BY MR. WHITE (Resuming):

And this is about the Lease Sale 149, but I also would like to say that I think you've sold people out with the sales before this lease sale, that are out there that people should be aware of, and the ones that are -- as soon as you reconsider this one, are going to be proposed. Anyway, I don't know much, but here's what I'm going to say.

Image. Man, the ultimate destroyer. How does man seek to regain his image? We could start by looking into our own hearts. For myself, since I was a child, I always was outside playing, touching the ground, smelling the flowers and the air, and watching the animals and talking with them, all of them, all the time, and still do today. The nice thing about nature and animals is they both give and take; it's a balance.

I think we, as man, have done a lot of taking. But as we go forward, we should look and focus on the giving because it is a balance. Our Creator will show us pity if we can change our image -- Man, the ultimate giver. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Daniel Zatz, followed by Patty Lightcap.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DANIEL ZATZ

My name is Daniel Zatz, and it's Post Office Box

1266 -- well, no -- Box 2666, Homer 99603. And I'm here representing myself. My notes are a mess, so bear with me here.

First of all, good evening. Thanks for coming here.

Lease Sale 149 isn't simply a question of oil, and it's not just a question of the value of wildlife, of fishing, tourism, or recreation. It's really a question of community. The people of Homer live with these waters. They work on them; they eat from them. Businesses depend on the tourism these waters bring in. Our community has evolved relying on clean water, and we expect our government to ensure its protection, not its destruction.

I'd like to talk for a minute about the EIS. The EIS is supposed to assess the environmental effects of Lease Sale 149, but it really doesn't. It's supposed to be fair and unbiased, but it's not. It should base conclusions on sound scientific reasoning, but it doesn't even do that. From characterizing a 27-percent probability of a 50,000-barrel oil spill as being a low probability to using killer whale biology to assess the spill effects on beluga whales because both animals have teeth, this document has serious problems.

For example -- some more -- humpback whales, on pa- -- in Section 3.B.1.8, it reads that the current North Pacific humpback whale population numbers around 2,000 animals and that about 2,000 individuals use the waters in or adjacent

to Cook Inlet. So roughly half the humpback whale population of the North Pacific uses these waters. A few pages later, in the environmental assessment of a 50,000-barrel spill, the document reads that only 5 percent of the humpback whales will be affected. What happened to the other 45 percent? You'll find that at Section 4.B.156.

As I mentioned, beluga whales are also discussed. This section reads that since not much is known about beluga whales, we're going to have to rely on killer whale biology to figure out what's going to happen to beluga whales in a spill. That's not acceptable. You'll have to do more homework on beluga biology.

#### (Applause)

I'm going to skip a big section here because there's just too many people to talk, but to sum up some of what I was going to say, I'll just read from Section 4.B.127, where it reads,

"Based on these assumptions...."

Where we're looking at a spill of 50,000 barrels,

"Based on these assumptions and the estimated points of contact, oil as-...."

And wait. And now, I have to say that this is only mentioned once in this EIS, and it's significant. I'll start again:

"Based on these assumptions and the estimated points of contact, oil associated with a base

case spill is estimated to contact about 50 percent of the intertidal and shallow subtidal habitat within the Cook Inlet and Shelikof Straits area. It is further estimated that of this 50 percent, about 40 to 60 percent of the marine invertebrates contacted would either be killed or would be sub-lethally affected."

That is not acceptable.

### (Applause)

All of the wildlife mortality probability assessments are based on trajectory models that assume oil will flow from a spill area to one point. This -- the document calculates -- the EIS calculates the effects of a spill on wildlife based on the premise that oil will flow from a spill, hit land, and that's it. And that's crazy. You even say it in your own document, what's going to happen. When there's a spill, it may cover half of lower Cook Inlet. It's going to hit more than just one spot.

Another problem with the EIS. A spill is assumed to happen in 15-knot winds. Cook Inlet is known for some of the wildest winds anywhere. In October, there were winds of over 100 miles an hour in the Barren Islands for nearly a week. Looking at the effects of a spill under only ideal conditions is totally inadequate. Using an average wind speed is completely misleading, and you should be using worst case

scenarios if you really care about the validity of the EIS.

(Applause)

Furthermore, on winds, the wind information calculated in the EIS appears to have been gathered using average wind velocity and direction from Kenai, Homer, Kodiak, and an area considered Marine Area A, which looks like Shelikof Strait. Taking samples from these areas misses wind conditions for the very heart of the sale area, which is significant. It's at a break in the Alaska Range where Lake Iliamna is where the wildest winds come from; 60-, 70-, 100-knot winds are not so uncommon, and yet none of your data reflects that.

The 2,000-barrel spill projections, it was already mentioned, but I need to repeat it. I think it's outrageous that you only ran the environmental assessment for this for only the month of April. It's totally inadequate. Try running the numbers in late summer when sea birds are fledging, when humpback whales are in the Barrens, when bears are walking the beaches, and things will look much, much worse.

I understand that you want to paint a sweet picture of what happens if you lease this area, but I want to see the effects of a 2,000-barrel spill for each month of the year. These are just a few examples, and you're hearing more, and you'll continue hearing more, and I'll add more in my written commentary. I have just a couple more things to say.

McNeil River bears. There is no place in the world

like McNeil River; it's a national and worldwide treasure. And I'm going to have to appeal to your sense of practicality here, regardless of the probability numbers that are in the EIS, because based on your own data, when there's a 50,000-barrel spill and oil is covering -- sporadically covering half of lower Cook Inlet, we're just going to have to assume that some of that's going to enter Kamishak Bay. And if a spill occurs at the wrong time of year, those bears are dead.

I really can only speak for myself, but I believe there are thousands of people throughout the world who will echo my feelings that you may not threaten McNeil River bears. The bears there are not negotiable, not....

(Applause)

.....for national security.....

(Applause)

They're not negotiable for national security, not for big money, not for anything.

So I'll conclude by saying stop this crazy idea now. Tell Mr. Babbitt that you made a mistake, that you forgot to consider the community of life, both human and otherwise, that will be lost here, that the money to the U.S. Treasury from the leases will never replace the community destroyed by this development. I appeal to you to let this one go now. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

1

### 2

## 4

## 3 4

## 5

## 6

## 7

## 8

# 9

## 10

## 11

## 12

## 13

## 14

## 15

## 16

## 17

## 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Patty Lightcap, with Bill Choate next.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. PATTY LIGHTCAP

Hello. My name is Patty Lightcap. My address is P.O. Box 1686 in Homer.

The first thing I'd like to say is one of the reasons that I have moved to Homer is because of the beauty of the area and the fact that I have a daughter, and I'd like to raise her in a beautiful area with a beautiful environment. And given the fact of this oil sale, it says that this oil sale borders five national wildlife refuges, four national parks and preserves, and numerous State-designated critical habitat areas. These areas are homes to the humpback whales, the steller sea lions, sea birds, McNeil River bears, and salmon, herring, cod, halibut, and the numerous other wildlife.

And that is something that everybody in their lifetime ought to have the opportunity to see. And for oil to come down here and to develop, it would kill all of that. There would be no bears. There would be no sea wipe that out. And then what would there be here for our lions, whales. children and their children? There would be nothing. It would be a devastated area. There would be no fishing. There would be no fish to fish. There would be no tourism; there would be nothing for them to come here for. There would be no sports fishing. There would be no McNeil River bears. There -- and

what would be here would not be healthy enough for anyone to eat and live off of.

Your predictions predict that there's a 72 (sic) probability of a major spill. And you also say that there's a 100-percent probability of a minor spill. Well, a 100-percent probability of a spill, to me, is not safe, it's not good enough. The only safeguard to oil development is no oil development. And I agree with.....

### (Applause)

And I agree with the Alternative No. 2 for no lease sale alternative.

And the last and final thing I have to say is that what we need to be looking at in this day and age, in this time in our area, is not a non-reusable fuel. We need to be checking into reusable resources and alternative energy. There's many things, there's many technology (sic), and I believe that you people have them, and you people could even be looking into them. And we need to get off the one track, short-term non-reusable resources and focus, and have our main focus on, alternative energy and reusable resources. Thank you.

#### (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Bill Choate, who's followed by Dora C-o-e-n, I believe it is.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. BILL CHOATE

My name is Bill Choate. I've lived here on the

Peninsula for most of my life. I'm curious -- oh, that's Box 1 2 493, Homer, Alaska. I'm curious of, did you three people help write this 3 document? 4 MR. BROCK: 5 No. MR. CHOATE: You didn't? 6 7 MR. BROCK: Hmm mm (negative). 8 BY MR. CHOATE (Resuming): I just -- it's sort of awkward for me to read a 9 document of this size with no published author. It's an awful 10 11 lot of pages. COURT REPORTER: He's not coming across. 12 MR. BROCK: Can you speak a little closer? 13 (Microphone readjusted) 14 BY MR. CHOATE (Resuming): 15 Let me see. I'm against this lease sale for quite a 16 few reasons, but I'd just like to address a couple. 17 commercial fisherman, so I'd like to quote something here. Ιt 18 19 says, "The Exxon Valdez oil spill experience has dem-20 21 onstrated that compensation to the commercial fishing industry for participating in the 22 cleanup of a large Cook Inlet oil spill is 23 likely to exceed these economic losses by 24

several orders of magnitude."

1 I'd just like to say that that's total hogwash. I'd just like 2 you to find somebody who..... 3 (Applause) I think that's pure opinion, and that's not science. That's 4 5 not quoting valid statistics. 6 You go on to say over here, 7 "A large oil spill would generate 5,000 cleanup 8 jobs for six months of the first year.' 9 Well, gee thanks. That makes me feel really good, you know. 10 (Applause) A good boost to our economy. On down a little farther, it 11 12 says, "Based on the Exxon Valdez oil spill experience, 13 14 these losses are likely to occur for only one or two years over the thirty-year life span of the 15 proposal and are likely to be fully compensated 16 several times over by the oil industry." 17 That doesn't make me feel any better at all. 18 19 like for you to consider for a minute, if a neighbor approached 20 you and said, 'Look. I'm going into the cesspool pumping 21 business, and there's a pretty good chance that my truck is going to spill onto your lawn....' 22

(Laughter, applause)

'....sometime in the next two years. But don't worry. I'll pay you well to clean it up.' You know, that's what this is

23

24

1 saying to me. So.... 2 (Applause) 3 This report is not objective. I see much, much 4 opinion in it, and I really -- I'm really against this. Thank 5 you. 6 MR. BROCK: Thank you, Bill. 7 (Applause) 8 Would you spell your last name, please? MR. BROCK: 9 MR. CHOATE: C-h-o-a-t-e. Thanks. 10 MR. BROCK: Thank you. Did he say p-h.... 11 (Applause) 12 MR. BROCK: ....or c-h? 13 MR. BOUDREAU: Choate, C-h-o-a-t-e. Choate. 14 MR. BROCK: I have two letters here that I received that will go in the -- from Julie A-p-e-r-s-o-n, I believe it 15 16 is, Aperson, and Shelly Gill, G-i-l-1, I believe it is. They **17** will go in the record, too. Dora? 18 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. DORA COEN 19 My name is Dora Coen, and I live in Fritz Creek. My address is P.O. Box 15273, Fritz Creek, Alaska. And I'm for 20 21 the no lease sale. 22 I believe if you -- if we do this, we are robbing our children's future by a one-time, short-term gain. 23 We are 24 stealing our children's healthy environment and leaving them 25 with a sick, dead, and dying planet.

Any pollution is too much. We need zero pollution tolerance, or we will destroy our planet. Oil is not a zero pollution energy. We need to stop this in our front yard and everywhere else, and we need to find other ways, and we will find other ways, to sustain our energy needs and economy.

I'd also like to say that we most definitely will have a major earthquake soon, and not just one but many. If we do this oil thing, how -- I don't see how we could prevent the oil from spilling and having another zillion-gallon spill. I still remember the Exxon oil spill; I was there. I still remember all the dead animals washing up on the beaches in Homer and the outer coast. I don't want to see that happen again.

I'm representing life. I'm representing this planet. So please, I'm for the no lease sale.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Deborah Oppenheimer (sic), with Nina Faust next.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. DEBORAH OPPENHEIM

Hi. And it's Deborah Oppenheim, no -e-r. I live at 54270 Wilderness Lane, Homer. Lease 149 is short-sighted. I don't know how many reasons you need to stop this process. I mean, but here's a couple.

The economic benefits do not justify the probable damages. The damages to fishing and tourism that depend on

clean water and clean air and clean -- are just -- they're not for sale. And that's just not acceptable. The few who benefit by this are well outnumbered by the many who have everything to lose. Our community is what we have to lose.

And this area is just not stable. Earthquakes, volcanic activity, and severe tides are reason enough not to allow drilling. Now, Alacuminara (ph) 1989 was just not that far away. It just doesn't make sense. You know, Alternative 2 is really the only alternative that makes sense. Thank you very much.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Nina Faust, followed by L-o-s-c-h-e-r, I bel- -- L-o-t-s-c-h-e-r. Go ahead.

MS. FAUST: Brother Isaiah requested that you go back to the list. Somebody signed his name, and he forgot to put an asterisk next to it.

MR. BROCK: Brother Isaiah?

MS. FAUST: Yeah. And he was.....

MR. BROCK: Okay.

MS. FAUST: He was right after Charles Davis.

MR. BROCK: Okay. I'll call on him next then.

MS. FAUST: Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Right after this next speaker I already

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

called.

2223

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.5

24

1 MS. FAUST: Okay.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. NINA FAUST

My name is Nina Faust. I'm speaking for the Kachemak Bay Conservation Society, Box 846, Homer. Our organization, for your information, has been around since around 1975 and has been actively fighting oil leases in the Kachemak Bay area and in the lower Cook Inlet region since 1975. And we're pretty darned tired of having to come back every single year to fight these things.

### (Applause)

After reading about the buy-back of leases in Bristol Bay and the cancellation of leases in the Chukchi Sea, we are appalled that Lease Sale 149 is going forward for lower Cook Inlet, which suffered extensive damage in the 1989 Exxon spill and is also an area of special concern. As we have watched the pollution of the oceans worldwide from oil spills and other environmental disasters, and have experienced the heartache of the Exxon oil spill, we have come to realize how important it is to protect the lower Cook Inlet from oil development.

Clean water, clean air, and abundant marine sources that are safe to eat are important to our way of life. We do not want these values compromised, and we don't want these values mitigated. Communities affected by the oil spill have not even fully recovered from its effects.

This country needs to achieve its energy independence by encouraging conservation and developing alternative energies rather than continuing its dependence on oil and other polluting hydrocarbons. Dependence on oil can be drastically reduced by promoting intensive research into emerging technologies using photovotegs (ph), fuel cells, and other alternative forms of energy, as well as energy conservation. We've been pretty retrogressive since the Carter years when a lot of these things were instituted and then undone by the Reagan/Bush era. Some oil reserves should be left also for the future as -- for as yet undeveloped technologies.

The Kachemak Bay Conservation Society strongly opposes Lease Sale 149 and urges the federal government to cancel the sale. The Clean Water Act is supposed to protect our waters from pollution. However, under its provisions, oil companies are granted permits to pollute. The drilling platforms in upper Cook Inlet have not abided by their permits. We are concerned about chronic, long-term pollution. What are the effects of such pollution on the marine food web? It's finally time to consider zero discharge for all rigs in the Inlet.

We also have strong concerns about the impacts of exploration, development, and production. Exploration brings seismic testing, which can kill fish and marine mammals.

Development and production bring the possibility of accidents and spills, as well as pollution from dumping of drilling muds.

We find the 87-percent risk of a serious spill totally unacceptable. Additional drilling rigs in the Inlet increase the dumping of toxic drilling muds and create possible conflicts with fishermen who use these areas. We also contend that drilling in the lower Inlet would likely bring increased oil related tanker traffic into Kachemak Bay and lower Cook Inlet.

Another concern is that despite having some of the most treacherous waters in the world in Cook Inlet, we have yet to institute any tug requirements for tankers or any coherent tanker traffic navigational safety plan, a major requirement of the Alaska Oil Spill Commission. Absolutely no drilling should go forward without addressing this issue. There have been recently, numerous incidences in Cook Inlet where tankers have lost power and have been disabled. Tankers, drilling platforms, and especially pipelines will be vulnerable to damage from volcanism, earthquakes, and tsunamis. So far, we've been extremely lucky, but the odds are against us.

Oil leases in lower Cook Inlet increase our chances of suffering another major devastating spill, and that's a chance we do not want to take. Interestingly, big industries like oil and timber usually tout development as a jobs opportunity. Those who benefitted most from the Exxon Valdez oil spill cleanup were often from other states or were a minority of the local population. The reality is that most of the workers in both industries are brought in from outside, and

2.0

maybe about 12 percent of our local people will be hired.

Most of the new employment will be low end service jobs. Meanwhile, the local communities will experience the growth and have to pay for the required additional services through increased taxes. Most residents do not receive any benefits from these oil leases. In fact, if anything, their quality of life declines, and their expenses go up.

Sociological impacts to a community are very real, but they are rarely addressed by EIS planners. The spill had significant impacts on many coastal communities, and these effects take a long time to correct. An oil lease in lower Cook Inlet would have drastic impacts on Homer. The demographics would change as more oil workers and their families move here.

Concomitant problems, such as alcohol and drug abuse, domestic violence, child abuse, and increased crime are just some of the social problems that have come in the wake of the oil spill, and potentially, these can come with sudden increased development. And certainly, with the high probability of another big oil spill, we will be severely affected again. So who pays these costs, and who benefits? And besides that, federal oil lease sales generate no returns to the State from bids or royalties.

Our local economy is tourist and fishing oriented.

Tourists are not coming here to see oil rigs and development.

In fact, oil pollution, as demonstrated by the Exxon Valdez oil spill, is detrimental to the visitor industry. Many businesses suffered economic loss in the wake of the spill and are still struggling to recover. We do not want to jeopardize our tourist and fishing economy in the future by developing oil leases in the lower Cook Inlet.

Environmental degradation that oil development will bring includes reduced air quality, chiefly from the natural gas flares. Homer and lower Cook Inlet currently have excellent air quality. In contrast, the Kenai/Nikiski area is do- -- which is dominated by the oil industry, is already the most polluted area in EPA's Region X because of toxic emissions. The toxic emissions from an oil rig equal a small city. It's not acceptable to us to add the equivalent of several numerous small cities' toxic emissions to lower Cook Inlet. There.....

### (Applause)

And there are absolutely no guarantees right now that the oil industry will operate cleanly. The Kenai/Nikiski area has a history of industrial abuses, including illegal dumping, like the Poppy Lane incident and other pollution problems. And we don't want that in the lower Cook Inlet region.

Prevention and response capability in Cook Inlet is also below par. While Nikiski and Drift River are among the most dangerous ports, the Inlet is the only significant ship-

ping area not protected by large-scale oil spill response organizations such as the Marine Spill and Prevention Corporation or the Alyeska CISPRI and Alaska Clean Seas, which, unfortunately, are inadequately -- are inadequate as presently constituted.

The Kachemak Bay Conservation Society urges you to cancel Lease Sale 149. It's time this nation explored true energy independence by developing clean alternative energy sources and by accentuating conservation. Thank you very much.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Charles (sic) Lotscher, followed by Brother Isaiah.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CLAUS LOTSCHER

My name is Claus Lotscher. I live -- P.O. Box 1741....

MR. BROCK: Could you spell your last name to be.....
MR. LOTSCHER: L-o-t-s-c-h-e-r.

BY MR. LOTSCHER (Resuming):

I represent myself and my children. I want to voice my opposition, and use just one out of many reasons why I do not want this oil lease sale to go on, and that's the danger of a tsunami created by Augustine Volcano.

EIS mentions the 1883 eruption of Augustine, which created a tsunami of 7 to 9 meters, which is roughly 30 feet,

and reached Nanwalek within 30 minutes. I quote:

"Some damage was done in lower Cook Inlet."

That's the only commentary to this tsunami. It doesn't say that it happened, luckily, during a minus tide.

We know that a tsunami destroyed large areas in Hawaii. The tsunami was created on Adak Island in the Aleutians. Big part of the city of Hilo in Hawaii were destroyed by a tsunami which was created in Chile, South America.

There are simple areas -- or there are areas where we can extract oil, but there are also areas that are too sensitive, environmentally too precious, too hazardous, and too beautiful. There are areas you just have to stay off. Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait are all of that. We cannot develop them. Thanks.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Brother Isaiah, followed by Julie C-e-s-a-r-i-n-e.

BROTHER ISAIAH: That is Julie Cesarine.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF BROTHER ISAIAH

Oh, like to welcome you brothers to Cosmic Hamlet by the Sea. And, oh, you mentioned the April 19th closing of the sale, or how did you relate to the April 19th.....

MR. BROCK: Comments would be received up till that time.

BROTHER ISAIAH: Up to that time. Well, my birthday is April the 19th.

MR. BROCK: And that's the way we planned it.

(Applause)

BY BROTHER ISAIAH (Resuming):

And my living here in Homer's been since 1959, and when the oil leases were sold out here in the Bay, I believe it was by Egan, well, we campaigned for Brother Hammond to buy the oil leases back. And he did, and procedures were taken that the oil leases were bought back.

So I believe that we have a cosmic obligation to Mother Nature, to ourselves, and to the love of our fellow man here in this community, to brothers and sisters, and I think we ought to evolve into a higher cosmic view of life and the care of Mother Nature and let this oil lease go by the wayside at this time.

So we love you, brothers, for all the good work you've done, but I think the oil lease should be -- go by the wayside this time. So thank you very much, and a lot of love to all the brothers and sisters that have come to give their testimony and to give perfect, beautiful information relating to this ongoing process. So thank you very much.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

1

(Applause)

I'm Julie Cesarine.

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Julie?

MR. BROCK:

MS. CESARINE:

MR. BROCK: Okay. And then she'll -- Julie will be followed by Joy Post.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. JULIE CESARINE

And I'm privileged to follow Brother Isaiah. name is Julie Cesarine. I -- my box number is 812 in Homer. And I represent the Rainbow Hemp Farmstead, all the people, the critters living on that land and flying over it.

And I want to thank you well-intentioned gentlemen for all the work you've done in trying to make life better for us on this planet. I hope that you are enjoying your stay in It's a beautiful, loving, forgiving community. We are blessed beyond belief.

Even now, when a good half of us are ill with the influenza that is affecting this city, our nation, and possibly the world, and I think it's very significant that we are suffering at this time because we have polluted our environments, our physical environment, our spiritual and moral environment, to the point of awareness. I guess it's awareness that brings And you see, it's an ill wind that blows no good. us here.

And we have all come together here, and we stand together, and praise the Lord, we have a large number of young people in our audience tonight, and there are many, many more.

And this is what they are going to inherit. And they love this, and they want to live in this fine community and on our beautiful planet Earth.

You did precipitate our coming together, and I hope we can receive you again at a more casual and loving time. You don't want to come back when our ire and our anger and our sorrow and bitterness are magnified and that we stand many, many, many more because this is a time of self-reflection, and it is a lenten time, and it's probably appropriate that it comes at this time. It's a looking into ourselves and to know what our real priorities are, that we want a healthy environment.

We want -- if you could do anything for us, please, you will promote, in whatever capacity in our government, our -- it's called alternative energy, but I hope one day it won't be alternative. It will be the energy that comes from the sun, that comes from the wind, and from our natural forces, and that we should use -- save our oil. As Charles Davis said, save it for a time for those very important things that we need it for, for pharmaceuticals and plastics.

And we would like to say that you instituted a time when we will have to do no more oil drilling and no more leases. And I thank you very much.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Joy Post, with Abby L-a-i-n-g.

And, Dick, would you please come back up here a second?

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. JOY POST

Hi. My name is Joy Post. I live on Kachemak Drive in Homer. And I'm not going to read everything I wrote out, but I just wanted to say a few things.

The damages from a spill, we know today, can never be eradicated, reversed, or glossed over. No matter the quantity or the quality of gear on hand to clean up a spill, it would be a rare day that the seas would be calm enough to have this gear do even a tiny bit of good. Spills can't be cleaned up, and we know that.

Today our marine environment suffers from pollution and habitat destruction, leading to the loss of several million tons of edible marine fish a year. This is not acceptable. We need clear policies that will care for the marine environment, not destroy it, as it is happening right now in Cook Inlet. Destroying areas like this for energy no longer makes sense.

Now, in 1992, 106 nations got together in Rio de Janeiro; United States was one of those nations. And they signed a treaty stating that the energy we use today is no longer acceptable to the world because of the damage it is doing. And it is time for all of these nations to look to different energy sources.

I think tonight you are seeing people here that are saying, 'We want other energy sources because we want our environment the way it is.' And I sincerely hope tonight, after hearing all the testimony, you will be the ones to start this treaty that was signed three years ago, making it into a valid working document for the good of our area, our state, and our nation. And thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Abby, followed by Larry Smith.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. ABBY LAING

Hi. My name is Abby Laing, and my address is 35035 Wilbur Street. And I think that we should vote no on Proposition 149 because, for one, it will wreck our view of the mountains.

There's over a 70-percent chance of an oil spill, and we, the Alaskans, will have to pay for the cleanup. We will also have to suffer in the fishing industry for those of us who fish or eat fish. The oil derricks will not bring any money into the Homer, Alaska, but in the event of an oil spill, we all have to pay a whole lot.

If they want to dig oil, they can go elsewhere. It's our future. Why wreck it?

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501

Phone: (907) 272-4084

MR. BROCK: Larry Smith, followed by Larry K-l-i-z-n-a-r.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. LARRY SMITH

I'm Larry Smith. I represent the Kachemak Resource Institute. For three years after the oil spill, we were the sponsor of the Cook Inlet branch of the Oil Reform Alliance. I brought a sample case with me today 'cause I didn't want to load my pickup. These are the last documents related to those three years' work that I have in my house. I made a couple of trips with my truck from there to take them over and shove them in a room at the office.

We don't have any more faith in government, although we recognize that some of the best environmentalists work for government agencies, including the Minerals Management Service, work for oil companies. And they are amongst the many people who would tell us about the shortcoming in both the government's ability and will to enforce the law. The Coast Guard, the EPA, agencies of the State of Alaska do not have a strong enough will to enforce the law when they come up against the political strength of the oil industry.

So I'm going to give you the names of these documents in this case for your record. I looked only at the ones you had listed, and I didn't see these amongst your references, and they are amongst the most useful when we decide these issues otherwise.

1.1

1

# (Pause, laughter)

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Our guess, you know, it's much better to have these meetings with people talking to their neighbors because that's the most important outcome of these gentlemen coming to town, is that we get our act together once in a while. We owe them some thanks for that.

The first document.....

(Laughter)

We have a document here prepared for the Department of Revenue, the State of Alaska, by the Director of Petroleum Accounting at the University of North Texas. It's called "Oil Industry Profitability in Alaska." It shows that the hourly profit rate, after-tax profits, earned by the producers, expipeline and Valdez from the North Slope, to be \$463,144 per hour, 24 hours a day, for each of the first 10-1/2 years of ANS production, and it hasn't gone down much since. This is after all expenses and taxes, does not count the down-range profits from shipping, from manufacture, and for sale to consumers.

And it just makes me wonder why those same companies who also operate in Cook Inlet are now willing to come forward and put the money into prevention and response activities, that they can clearly afford. But what bothers me the most over these years is that the amount of money that goes into lobbying in places like Juneau and Washington, D.C., the amount of money that goes into public relations campaigns and television advertising, trying to sell the cleanest of the industry would go a hell of a long way to creating a real prevention program to keep oil in the market place and out of the environment.

When I see that commitment from these companies, or a commitment from government, to make the big oil companies behave that way, then I could start to consider -- just start to consider -- supporting an oil and gas lease sale, but certainly not in a sensitive area.

The other documents that I have here that somehow escaped reference in this Environmental Impact Statement are the documents about Cook Inlet by the State of Alaska Citizens Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances, "A History of Alaska's Oil and Hazardous Substance Release Response Fund." These documents are the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation "Draft Oil Discharge Prevention Contingency Plan" that was put on the back burner in the last Administration and no longer represents rules that anybody's going to have to pay much attention to.

One of the most basic documents that other people referred to, "Spill: The Wreck of the Exxon Valdez." This is the work of the Alaska Oil Spill Commission. This represents a compilation of studies and analyses by some of the most expert consultants in the world. And they, like anybody else with real expertise, identify Cook Inlet not only as a place where you're going to have oil spills, but the most likely place for

the next large oil spills.

(Applause)

This is some of the "Alaska Marine Ice Atlas," and it was evidently not used for a reference in the analysis of ice effects for other activities associated with this oil and gas lease sale. It comes from the Arctic Environmental Information Data Center at the University of Alaska.

We have here a report that was done by the folks that

We have here a report that was done by the folks that operate the prevention and response mechanism at the Sullenbow (ph) Terminal in the Shetland Islands. And it was also referenced by other people, and it's a document which is directly aimed at the safety of navigation and oil spill contingency plans in Cook Inlet.

This is a document -- I guess I should stack all of these up. There's five volumes of this report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Of course, that's the committee Don Young has now, but when George Miller had it, this is a study of the Alyeska Pipeline Service Company covert operations. The President of the Oil Reform Alliance, the operator of a charter business in Valdez, fishermen, and others received a settlement, after a very long time dealing with Alyeska, because Alyeska had to admit, yes, they did tap these folks' telephones after the oil spill; yes, they did get into these people's mail; and, yes, they did owe them some money. And that's another example of why people around here don't have a

hell of a lot of faith in big oil.

2

3

1

(Applause)

There's a really good work done right here in Homer,

4

5

Alaska, mostly by Michael O'Meara, the curator of the Darkened Waters exhibit for the museum that's now touring the nation.

6

(Applause)

7

The written record that goes with that was written by Nancy Lord. It's called "Review of the History, Science, and Technology Associated With the Oil Spill and Cleanup." That's a document you gentlemen should read.

9 10

Oh, there's another volume on the covert operations.

11 12

Here's something you should see in evidence. The tag

13

that just fell on the floor says that this is an evidence tag of the Alaska State Troopers. This is a little squid. When

14 15

Don Young and Frank Murkowski and an admiral and some other

16

folks from the Department of the Interior came visiting Homer

17

after the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and the representatives of

18

Exxon had a dog and pony show going on in the City Council

19

Chambers we just came from, the representatives from Exxon were

20

holding up clean pom-poms and telling the bigwigs from Washing-

21

ton, D.C., there was not going to be any oil in Kachemak Bay,

22

our friends in Port Graham sent us over -- and we got them off

23

the plane and walked in just when that statement was being

made -- dead things from the beaches, oiled pom-poms.

24

25

The meeting kind of came apart at that point. There

was very little time left for conversing with Exxon. Convicted once again. Another reason it's really hard to have faith around here.

## (Applause)

Anyway, finally is, another thing that shakes my faith, there's only one reference -- since I'm not as good a student as Aaron Wind (ph) or some of these other guys upstairs, I didn't really get to read this whole Environmental Impact Statement. But I did read these back-to-back statements:

"However, the effects on fisheries resources due to oil spills in the cumulative case are not expected to be much different than those resulting from the base case. This is because effects to fish populations due to oiling generally are low and not expected to be as great as natural environmental percubations (ph)."

A percubation is something that doesn't disturb you very much,

I think.

All right. The next line is headed, "Commercial Fishing."

"Commercial fishing is the most likely source to dramatically affect finfish abundance in the sale area over the 19-year life of the proposal. Species most heavily fished are most at risk,

including sockeye and king salmon."

And I guess that suggests to me that this may be more useful as an Environmental Impact Statement about commercial fishing.

It's quite plain if you have an oil spill and you can't have those fishermen out there killing salmon, that the salmon are going to be a lot more abundant.

(Laughter, applause)

Anyway, I really do think that the cumulative effects of development activities section of this document is particularly weak. It lacks a real history of prevention; it doesn't lay out the costs and benefits very clearly. It's really important to know where the money is going to go and what it's going to be used for. If it's going to go downstream and profits to big oil, then it's going to have an entirely different effect than if it was spread around here.

And until government starts observing the law -- like these very Acts that the gentleman was discussing when we began, the National Environmental Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Pollution Discharge -- the NPDES, whatever that stands for -- you know, we don't have much enforcement. The EPA did catch up with about a fifth of the number of the polluting violations that Trustees for Alaska, fishing groups, and Greenpeace caught up with. Government needs to accelerate the pace if it wants to participate in these things.

I think that the cumulative effects of other development activities, like logging on the Kenai Peninsula, which is being logged at two and a half times more acres annually than the Tongass National Forest. This is one of the principal places on the West Coast of North America for logging activi-

7 | else that might have an effect.

Anyway, for all those reasons, I'm not ready to place my faith in either the government or the industry. But I also, you know, was given a pretty good reason years ago, before the pipeline was built when Buckminster Fuller came to Alaska, and I was one of those people that followed him around. And I got to listen to him for about 10 hours and actually got to talk to him. And at one time, Buckminster Fuller was out talking to the kids at the college, and he broke off late, and he raced down to a hotel where the assembled engineers and architects of Alaska were putting on a lunch for him.

ties, and it's treated to a pretty brief paragraph of something

He came in 45 minutes late, and he said, 'I really can't stay 'cause I promised these kids I was going to get back out there.' He said, 'We're making progress.' He said, 'And I don't eat this kind of stuff anyway.' But he said, 'All I wanted to tell you is that I know' -- it was kind of a Brother Isaiah message -- he said, 'I know,' to these architects and engineers, 'that you men' -- and they were all men; there weren't any women there -- 'that you men are too good and too

honest to promote the creation of a pipeline when you know the energy solution is elsewhere.' He said, 'I know you will not allow yourselves to be ruled by greed.' And then he went back to the kids.

Thank you.

(Applause)

(Pause - Whispered consultation)

MR. BROCK: How do you pronounce that?

(Inaudible response)

MR. BROCK: Okay.

(Pause - Inaudible comments)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. LARRY KUZNAR

Quite some testimony. The guy left me standing here with this thing, so maybe I'll try to do it this way.

My name is Larry Kuznar, K-u-z-n-a-r. My address is 3280 Sunrise Lake, Milford, Pennsylvania. And I've come all the way from Pennsylvania to be here tonight to testify to you gentleman, but also to the people of the community. I....

(Applause)

I want to remind everyone that this is just not a local issue, but every citizen in the United States -- and that's who I'm representing tonight, me, one citizen of the United States of America -- has a vested interest in what goes on here in Cook Inlet and anywhere else in Alaska or the Lower 48. And this is a very serious situation.

I spent 30 years as a wildlife conservation officer, recently retired. I also have a background in business, in retail sales and real estate. So I can see both sides of the issue, the economic side as well as the environmental side.

And I have seen with my own eyes, in over a half a century of living and 30 years as a conservation officer, some very drastic changes that have happened in the eastern communities, both to their social structure and to the environment down there.

So if any of you really want progress fast, hell, get on a plane and fly on down, and I'll show you lots of it down there.

# (Applause)

You don't have to drag it all up here, you know, and do up here what's happened down there. And I've had to work, in the course of my conservation work, against, or try to bring back things that can't be brought back once they're ruined. I want to remind the board here, as well as the people, that progress is a two-edged sword. It brings, along with additional income, a lot of social ills and environmental ills that take even more money or, as I've already said, can't be corrected once it's happened.

You've got a very pristine, beautiful area up here. Why mess with it? There is no oil crisis at this time. We don't have to have the additional production of oil. No one's

sitting in lines down in New Jersey or New York waiting for three or four hours for gasoline like they did back in the '70s when the oil cartel decided to put the squeeze on us, which, I believe, it was at the suggestion of one of our Presidents, Nixon somebody or other, I think, was the one.

Now, the oil industry, I've seen other types of industries down there, and oil. Oil was first discovered in Pennsylvania, in the United States, and it's still being pumped out of the ground down there. So we have gone through all this a century ago of what you're doing now in Alaska and facing, along with the ship accident as well as the regular accidents that do occur and are expected to occur when you deal with something as unstable as oil in such a fragile area such as Cook Inlet. So we've already been down that road down there.

I thought I might come up here and settle in the Homer area, and have been up last summer and up again this year, but came specifically tonight to say that I'm not coming here if I've got to stare at some platform out there where whales used to breach and.....

## (Applause)

Mainly because I don't want to have my pristine aesthetic view spoiled by industrial nightmares, but also because I don't want to have to see something so beautiful die. I could go somewhere else, I guess, and just let it die up here all on its own. But as a concerned citizen of the United States, I not

only have a vested interest, as every single person in the United States has, I've got a responsibility that I can't walk away from.

# (Applause)

Neither can any of you. And neither can you, gentlemen, no matter what your job is. Your responsibility is to the citizens of the United States of America. And so as that concerned citizen, I urge you to reject any more oil expansion in Cook Inlet. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Off record)

(Tape Change - Tape No. 3 of 5)

(On record)

MR. BROCK: We're back on the record, and like I said earlier, we have about 45 to 50 names to go yet. And we will try to get through them as quick as we can, but we want to be sure that everybody has a chance to speak. One thing that would speed it up, if you would hold your applause. It's not that I -- I will stay here till you're done, but that will help you if you're anxious to get through. I don't have a time table tonight as far as I am concerned, so -- but that will help as far as you're concerned.

The next speaker is Richard Tyler, with Ola Martin on deck.

(Pause - Whispered consultation)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. RICHARD TYLER

My name is Richard Tyler, and I have lived here in Homer for quite a while, about 40 years.

MR. BROCK: Would you spell your name, please, sir?

MR. TYLER: T-y-l-e-r.

MR. BROCK: We're having a problem getting every-body's name spelled right.

MR. TYLER: Well, you've got it right in front of you; I signed in.

MR. BROCK: For the record.

COURT REPORTER: I need it for the record.

MR. TYLER: Oh. All right.

MR. BROCK: I'm sorry.

MR. TYLER: R-i-c-h-a-r-d. And I've never spelled my name like that before. T-y-l-e-r. Commonly known as Toby, if you want to really come.....

BY MR. TYLER (Resuming):

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A lot of -- by this time, a lot of things that I had planned to mention have been stated. But some of the things still haven't been said, a few of them.

One of them that's very important to me is the fact that, well, in exactly two and a half weeks will be the sixth anniversary of the oil spill. It's only been six years since the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and a lot has happened in that

time, and in fact, it seems like a lot longer.

But the two and a half weeks between now and that date are what I'm interested in because it was about two and a half weeks that the city of Homer and the people in Homer waited for that oil from the spill to come around along the far side of the mountains and enter our bay. And if you don't think that was a period of deep trauma for all of us, there was just really nothing we could do. It was on the way. Most disasters, like an earthquake, it happens and it's over, and then you clean up. But this was something that took a long time, and those first days were rather — were very traumatic.

What -- I have a tape that I -- I happened to be out of the house, and I left my radio taping a program. And right in the middle of it, KBBIR, public radio, interrupted with some of the emergency Bush messages about the oil spill and about what people were doing at that time, and I still have it. It's fascinating to listen to.

(Microphone readjusted)

I don't know anything about these machines.

But anyway, among the things, they were asking for people to congregate out on the spit and help build log booms. And a lot of people, everybody in town practically, volunteered and did all kinds of things. They were asking for food, volunteers to bring food to feed these people. It turned out the log booms were totally ineffective, but they were the only

thing we had, and it was psychologically important for these people to do these things. Just, you had to do something; you couldn't just sit and wait.

There were calls for people to work at the junior high school to make cages for the otters that were oiled and so on. This is -- this is what happened. And that's why all these people are here tonight, because we are still trying to get over that period of time.

Some of us, they began -- we began doing beach walks. Long before the oil entered the bay we began to pick up dead birds. In fact, a friend of mine and I were down on the beach between here and Anchor Point, and we picked up a little pigeon guillemot, one of the first oiled birds that preceded the oil. Of course, he'd been in the oil and then he'd flown up here, and he died in our hands. And that's the sort of thing these people went through, and we don't want to go through that again.

The Darkened Waters show, as somebody mentioned, is still on in our museum, and many people go in and relive these days and those horrible times. And it's also touring the nation.

Many people in town volunteered to go over and clean up Mars Cove. I'm amazed that nobody -- some of the people have actually testified and they didn't mention it. That was a major chore that these people did, completely voluntarily. And

they proved not so much that you can clean up oil because all it proved, really, was that people with no money and just the will to do it can do this cleanup and do just as good a job, and probably with less destruction to the environment, than all the money that Exxon was pouring into it.

Anyway, we're not past this, but what has happened now in the six years that have intervened, or the almost six years? Most of that time or various -- at least half of that time, of course, the cleanup activities were going on and various -- with various results. And finally, our Kachemak Bay critical habitat criteria was established. It was a critical habitat; it always has been a critical habitat since the buyback of the oil leases that somebody else mentioned. But they finally put a little -- some teeth in it, perhaps not enough, but Kachemak Bay is one of the richest bays in the world, possibly the richest bay in the world, and it is now a critical habitat. And there's no way you can put oil out in the Inlet and expect it to stay a critical habitat. It'll be just a critical mess.

And that isn't in my notes, but, you know.....
(Laughter)

....things just got -- we also finally got the buy-back of the park accomplished just a couple of years ago, usually, ironically enough, using State and federal money from the Exxon Valdez. This was once the richest bay in the world, and we

want to keep it that way.

And I'm going to skip on the fact that we don't have escort vessels and so on. All that has been mentioned by others. One thing that hasn't been mentioned, and a lot of people in town I don't think are even aware of it, but the Valdez Trustees are still trying to mitigate the — use the money for sensible things around the state to correct some of the mistakes from the Valdez oil spill.

And there is a small parcel acquisition going on right now, and our Overlook Park up here where you pull out -- and you must have driven past it if you drove down; maybe you flew. But if you ever drive down, you pull out at the pullout, you look down across that wonderful slide area, as we call it, with a few lakes at the bottom, and out over a very rich -- one of the few rich intertidal areas on this side of the bay, and then out over the Inlet. And should the Trustees go ahead and purchase that land so that it'll be preserved there so that we can always look at the view, it will be the extreme of the ironic if we have to look out at oil platforms from that point.

I think this is -- this whole thing is just ridiculous. Our government, which is you people should be
supporting -- coming to us and saying, 'Hey, we want to support
fuel-efficient vehicles, and we want to put in some better Cook
Inlet escort and cleanup capabilities.' And we want -- our
government should be coming and telling us we want -- they're

going to do energy conservation efforts. Certainly, sensible conservation efforts on energy could get much more fuel than they're ever going to find out in the Inlet.

And I'll just end with what I had on here. Because of all this spill and the fact that it's only six years, I would say that your -- I would conclude by saying your timing is dreadful, your Draft EIS is shocking, and our answer must be a resounding no.

## (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Olga Martin (sic), followed by Craig Martin (sic).

MR. MARTIN: Olga had to go home with a sick kid.

MR. BROCK: Okay.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CRAIG MATKIN

But it's Craig Matkin, M-a-t-....

MR. BROCK: Oh, I'm sorry.

#### BY MR. MATKIN (Resuming):

....M-a-t-k-i-n. I want to thank Toby. That was a great summary of the situation here.

I'm going to talk a little more specifically about the marine mammal section. I'm a marine mammal biologist and a commercial fisherman, a 22-year resident of the area.

I was -- to be honest, I was hoping for a lot better.

I was hoping that I'd learn something from this, but I was

absolutely shocked by the confusing and unscientific approach

that was taken in the marine mammal section. I just got this, and I've only had a short time to review it, and I haven't looked at the rest, but I will. Many of the statements seem biased and conflicting. I'll give you a few examples. I think Daniel Zatz mentioned that -- this, but I'll detail it a little bit more.

For the North Pacific humpback whale population, you list numbers of 1,200 to 2,100 as a population for the entire North Pacific. Then you state that there's an estimated 1,247 humpbacks from Cook Inlet to the Barren Island -- or to the Shumagin Islands -- excuse me -- during the feeding season. Now, that would indicate that 50 percent or more of this entire North Pacific humpback whale population uses this area. Now, this is the area from the lease sale down to the Shumagin Islands about 350 miles south, and it would be the path that oil would take if it was to leave the oil spill -- or the lease area.

Now, as he said, as Daniel stated, later on in this document -- I list the page numbers here, and I will provide those, but I'm not going to go through it -- you say that only 5 percent of the Pacific population uses the lease sale area or the adjacent waters. This is directly conflicting. I can't fathom this, how you can come up with something like this. It looks to me like bits and pieces of this were done by different people, shoved together, and there wasn't much communication on

it.

You state there was no effect on humpback whales after the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Prince William Sound. Well, what you failed to mention is that the humpbacks weren't even there at the time of the oil spill; they're migratory. In March of the -- by far, the majority of the whales are on the feeding ground. Maybe a few that might be earlier over winter in the Sound, but a majority are on the feeding -- are on the breeding grounds in the tropical Pacific, and they don't arrive till May or June. At that point in time, the free oil was on the beaches or down the coast.

The document states there was no mortality of Dalls (ph) porpoise or Pacific white-sided dolphins observed during or after the Exxon Valdez oil spill, even though the oil spill occurred in Dalls (ph) porpoise habitat. Well, how can you be so sure of this? It's -- well, you go on to say that,

"It seems possible that the effects -- that effects did occur on these porpoises but unlikely given the large amount of scientific research conducted in the area at the time and the opportunity to detect disoriented, sickly, or dead animals."

Well, first of all, there was absolutely no baseline data on Dalls (ph) porpoises in Prince William Sound before the spill, and there was no way to assess damages afterward. There

were no directed studies on Dalls (ph) porpoise. They were not observed or followed in any consistent manner following the oil spill.

There's -- I've followed marine mammals, humpback whales and killer whales, for hours to days at a time for the last 20 years. It's very difficult to pick out sickly animals. What happens is when an animal is sickly or in some way debilitated, it becomes prey to another organism rapidly, or it dies and sinks. You see, very seldom do you have animals strand ont he beaches. You have thousands of animals that die of natural causes in the North Pacific, marine mammals, every year. And yet you don't see them on the beaches. There's no record of them. It's very, very difficult to track mortality. So to sit here and say there was no mortality is incredibly misleading. You don't know, and the possibility exists.

In assessing the effect of the oil spill on belugas in the lease area, the document first states that there could be -- or that there were 242 belugas seen at one time in Cook Inlet on a single day. It goes on to state that because belugas share some of the characteristics with killer whales, you'll use the number 7 as the number of belugas killed out of the 242 that were counted following a sizeable spill.

Now, where does the number 7 come from? It's pretty interesting. This is something I never would have dreamed up.

Seven is the number -- besides being a lucky number, I guess --

is the number of killer whales that were initially missing at the time of the Exxon Valdez oil spill from AB pod in Prince William Sound. They were later confirmed as mortalities in a system that's used up and down the Pacific coast. So that's where this number comes from.

Now, the actual number that disappeared out of AB pod in that first year following the oil spill was 13, but I guess the number 7 is a better number. At any rate, that's where it comes from.

Now, the seven mortalities in the AB pod represented about 20 percent of that pod of 36 animals. I'm quite certain -- I'm the one that documented this. However, for reasons I can decipher from the EIS, only 15 percent of the pod was lost or -- was lost due to the oil. I don't know what happened to the other near 5 percent, or the other individuals. Somehow they decided that part of these whales wasn't killed by the oil. I'm not sure how they got there.

But what this tells you is that no matter what the size of a group, when you have an oil spill, you lose seven animals. That's the first thing that happens. It's something that I had no idea of and is one thing I learned from this document. I think that if you took 15 percent of the 242 belugas, you'd come up with a number more along the lines of 36, if you wanted to say that a certain percentage was always lost at the beginning of an oil spill. That might make a

2.2

little more sense, but I still think it's tenuous at best.

The document goes on to calculate recovery rates for belugas based on estimated reproductive rates and assures us that in two years the population would be returned to normal again. This type of approach would never, never withstand the scrutiny of any peer review group that I've ever dealt with. I wouldn't begin to launch something like this on a peer reviewed scientific group.

These poorly developed representations of risk presented in the marine mammal section casts a shadow on the validity of the entire document, which I will take time to review. I pick out the examples of interest at this time.

Nowhere is it clearly mentioned just how toxic the fumes or oil can be to a marine mammal if it's inhaled, or to any mammal for that matter.

There's so little baseline data visitations in the area that the sale of these waters or adjacent areas -- or there is so little baseline data for whales in this area that the sale of these waters is incredibly premature. I can't see how you can make any secure statements about what might happen to the whales in the area when you don't even know how many are out there for most of the species.

In the lease sale or adjacent waters are substantial numbers of the endangered humpback whale. There is no doubt. They feed here on an annual basis. The endangered sea lion

feeds and breeds in substantial numbers in areas adjacent to the spill -- or I should say soon to be endangered sea lion; I don't think it's been listed quite yet.

Let's not make their recovery more difficult by chronic exposure to hydrocarbons or the effects of a large spill. Let's halt this sale until we have a fair bit more data on what's out there and what the true effects might be. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Michelle Jennings, followed by S-t-o-n-o-r-o-v, I believe it is.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MICHELLE JENNINGS

Hi. Welcome to Homer. This is a very beautiful community.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

BY MS. JENNINGS (Resuming):

I really hope you recognize that.

My name is Michelle Jennings. I am a citizen of Homer. P.O. Box 2188 is my address. And I say no dirty industry. Please don't consider this meeting a pacification of extremist viewpoints. Respect and honor this political process, this public hearing. Please listen and honestly consider what my friends and fellow citizens have to say.

This decision affects our home, our children, and our

livelihoods. We are speaking for our health. If you really listen to us, you will hear a resounding no.

I love my home here in Homer. The beauty inspires me greatly. The thought of oil platforms, oily wastes, sludge, carcinogenic poisons sickens me. I ask you to recognize the bone of the matter, the most pertinent consideration of this issue. Please consider, Are these byproducts beneficial to mammals, plants, fish, trees, and children? Truly consider this issue. This is the question that we are asking.

The resulting answer is the most honest answer you can give to the question, Should we? Please don't, don't swindle us with shady business deals. This is not an economic consideration; this is a health consideration. Do not deny that fact.

Alaska already has a cleanup challenge created by all oil development: waste and spill disasters. We must cooperate in recognizing and remedying those problems before embarking on a hazardous short-term profit venture with high potential for irreversible damage. And that's the key word there, "irreversible." We do not have the technology to prevent or remedy a disastrous oil spill.

Six years ago, our cleanup technology resorted to paper towels. We do not have the technology to clean up after an irresponsible industry dumping cancer agents into our water. We cannot control the inevitable. Let's not try. Do not deny

this fact: It is inevitable.

There are alternatives; there are healthy, productive solutions. Let's pursue them. Please show us true leadership. Make the ethical decision. Oil and Gas Lease Sale 149 is an absolutely preposterous idea. I say cancel it.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Dirk Stonover, S-t-o-n-o-r-o-v.

(No audible response)

MR. BROCK: Okay. We'll go Edgar Bailey, followed by Michelle Arm -- A-r-m-s-t-r-o-n-l, I believe it is.

(Pause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. EDGAR BAILEY

I'm Edgar Bailey, Box 2994, Homer, speaking on my own behalf.

As a biologist who has worked on marine mammals and birds for the last 26 years in Alaska, I'm adamantly opposed to the Lease Sale 149. I've seen the declines of many populations around the state, with great consternation, and I was very much involved in the cleanup activities and removal of birds in the Barren Islands and the outer Kenai coast in the sickening oil spill of 1989.

For nearly 20 years Homer residents have stridently opposed local oil development, going back to 1976 when we talked about the buy-back leases, as mentioned before. I'm not

going to go into more detail for the sake of time. And then most recently, we had State Lease Sale 78, and fortunately, the State leaders, even in the past Administration, deleted the tracts on the southern Peninsula in deference to the will of the people in this area.

I'm very much concerned about the long-term chronic pollution, which I don't think was adequately addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement, not to mention the likelihood of major spills, which is virtually a foregone conclusion over the long term. This region, as we've heard over and over, has already suffered enough with the Exxon spill in '89.

Homer is a unique community based on an economy of fishing and tourism and rural residential development, as well as the arts and crafts. The vast majority of people here came to avoid large urban areas and industrialized use. And I can certainly speak to that with great fervor myself, as an escapee of Southern California. I have witnessed the oil fields in Ventura County and Los Angeles County and seen what's happened in those areas, as well as other parts of the country, in the Gulf of Mexico and elsewhere. We don't want that here, in no uncertain terms.

Compare the industrial infrastructure at Nikiski and Kenai with the striking beauty and the different demographics of the Homer area. It's as different as day and night. And I think the majority overwhelmingly want to keep it that way. We

don't want to just become another Any Town, U.S.A., and certainly not replicate what's happened in the upper Cook Inlet and the Nikiski industrialized area.

In this area, we have a convergence, so to speak, of six parks and refuges. The first state park in Alaska was created over here at Kachemak Bay State Park, and it's very vulnerable to any future oiling, both chronic or a major catastrophe.

I find it very interesting when it was mentioned here by you folks that one of the purposes of this whole process is to inventory the oil that we have in this country. Well, I find it rather hypocritical at the same time that we're talking about opening ANWR and opening up new areas like this and special areas of concern, to lift the export ban. On one hand, we're talking about energy independence for the U.S., and on the other hand, we want to lift the export ban and ship it to Japan and the Far East. Now, does this make sense? I don't think so.

We are literally at the end of the road here in Homer, and we are sick and tired, quite frankly, of the bureaucratic arrogance that repeatedly tries to force oil development and industrialization on this special area. I think we're all -- have had enough of it. When will it end? We've gone through it for 20 years. Let us maintain the sense of community and environmental integrity of this special area. Please

cancel these leases once and for all.

Kachemak Bay and lower Cook Inlet, frankly, is the Monterrey of Alaska. And it's certainly of equivalent importance in productivity biologically as Bristol Bay where leases have been canceled.

I might ask you folks, Why were the leases canceled off of Monterrey, California? Can you answer that for us?

MR. BROCK: I di- -- I was not around, so I don't know what the....

#### BY MR. BAILEY:

2.4

Well, I think a lot of it has to do, if you look at the demographics of that area and the wealth in that community, because of the extreme number of people there with a great deal of wealth, and I think that had a lot of power in the political specter.

Quite frankly, we must accept limits to growth. That might be the dominant paradigm in this country, but quite frankly, where does it end? What is the definition of "progress"? Is more always better? Is bigger always better? Not so. And I think we have something very much worth defending here, and, quite frankly, I think it's quite clear that we don't want another Texas North in this community.

Please consider that. Thank you for your time.
MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Michael Armstrong, followed by Katie Kennedy.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MICHAEL ARMSTRONG

Yeah, that's Michael -- my name's Michael Armstrong, Michael as in the Saint, and Armstrong as in the astronaut.

And I'm a 15-year Alaskan resident, and I live up on Diamond Ridge Road, on Diamond Ridge.

While I support all oil and gas dev- -- oil and gas development, not oil. While I support oil and gas development in some areas of America's Outer Continental Shelf, I do not support such development in lower Cook Inlet, and I urge the Minerals Management Service to cancel Lease Sale 149.

I must concede that we Americans have a serious

Hydrocarbon Jones -- that's an addiction. Petroleum powers our

monitor stoves (sic), Subarus, and Heskavarna (ph) chainsaws.

Eventually, I hope that technological advances will increase

the efficiency of oil and gas and provide new energy sources so

that soon fossil fuels will become archaic. For now, we're

stuck with the cursed stuff and must find new sources of petro
leum. This doesn't mean we must find new sources of petroleum

here. Like a wise sage once said, 'We all have to poop, but we

don't do it on a public sidewalk.'

So tonight, the question is not whether we should explore for oil and gas in federal lands, but whether we should do so in lower Cook Inlet. As responsible citizens of the

United States, we must balance local and state interests with the national interests in all those respects. Is it in the United States' national interest to lease and explore for oil in lower Cook Inlet? I do not believe it is.

Alaska, and especially Kachemak Bay in lower Cook
Inlet, have become lands of escape for Americans who do live
with oil development in their back yard, to people who drive
all the way to Homer so that they can look out from Baycrest
Hill and say, 'Lookit there, Thelma. They have oil rigs out
there too, just like Louisiana.'

#### (Laughter)

No. They come here from thousands of miles away so they can say, 'My God. Look at those incredible mountains, that glorious sea.' They come here to be renewed by nature. To the visitors of Alaska, what is of the greater value, the modest federal oil revenues and oil supply that will come from oil and gas leasing of the lower Cook Inlet or the continued opportunities for recreation? I believe that our visitors would say recreation.

Those of you who have hosted visitors know how important it is for them to have places like lower Cook Inlet remain wild and undeveloped. We know the shock Americans felt when these lands were slimed by the Exxon Valdez spill, and we know the shock that would be felt if these lands were hit by another spill.

It is not enough to say, 'Protect these lands for our 1 own sake.' If this were a borough or State lease sale, such an 2 argument would have more merit. But this is a federal lease 3 4 As Americans, and not just as Homer residents, we have 5 the patriotic obligation to balance the needs of our nation with our own wants and desires. Fortunately, the national 6 interest is compatible with the local interest. To protect 7 8 this national treasure of lower Cook Inlet, a treasure in fact created by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act 9 of 1980, it is our duty as stewards of this land we call home 10 to protest this lease sale and urge MMS to cancel it, not just 11 Thank you. 12 for us, but for America. MR. BROCK: Thank you. 13 (Applause) 14 15 MR. BROCK: Katie Kennedy, followed by Alice 16 Haggerty.

(No audible response)

MR. BROCK: Katie? Alice Haggerty?

MR. HAGGERTY: She left.

MR. BROCK: She left. Are you Haggerty?

MR. HAGGERTY: Yes.

MR. BROCK: Do you want to take her place?

(Laughter)

MR. HAGGERTY: I do all the time.

(Laughter)

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MAKO HAGGERTY

My name is Mako Haggerty. That name is spelled M-a-k-o Haggerty, H-a-g-g-e-r-t-y. I'm a resident of Homer, Post Office Box 737. I've lived here for 13 years, and I'm a commercial fisherman.

I represent the North Pacific Fisheries Association here in Homer, a group of fishermen, and we would like to go on record in opposition of Lease Sale 149.

I'm not going to repeat a lot of our concerns because so many of our concerns have been eloquently presented here tonight. I would just like to caution you about the importance of the fishing industry to this community and the threat that oil poses to that industry. And it's not just what we see in terms of oil on the beaches and oil on top of the water, but also the things that we don't see, like the drilling mud that gets dumped over.

And if the past is any representation of what we have to look forward to in the future, there are no guarantees that the oil drilling practices and exploration is going to be a clean procedure out there. And when you mention the NPDES, whatever that is, and the precautions that are written in to protect the environment from spills, I'd like to remind you that a lot of this stuff is getting gutted out right now in Washington, and so there's no guarantees that these agencies are going to be there to protect us in the future.

And that's all I have to say right now. 1 there a time frame to get a formal position.... 2 MR. BROCK: Written comments are due April 19th.... 3 MR. HAGGERTY: Okay. 4 5 MR. BROCK: .....1995. MR. HAGGERTY: Thank you. 6 7 MR. BROCK: Thank you. 8 (Applause) I'm not sure how -- whether this is 9 MR. BROCK: spelled right. It looks like it's K -- or it's probably 10 spelled right; I just can't read it right. K-i-l-c-h-e-s from 11 12 East E-r-d Road, Homer. 13 (Simultaneous audience responses) 14 MR. BROCK: Would you please spell your name? 15 MR KILCHER: Yule Kilcher, Y-u-l-e K-i-l-c-h-e-r. 16 MR. BROCK: Okay. Thank you. 17 MR. KILCHER: You're welcome. 18 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. YULE KILCHER 19 Most things that needed saying tonight have been Reference was taken mainly to fishing and industry. 20 happen to be, among other things, a farmer. Farming hasn't 21 22 been mentioned. It has been much more prevalent 40, 50 years ago when I came to Alaska than it is now, for a variety of 23 But we should -- I mentioned it because it -- farm-24 ing, next to fishing and tourism and arts and crafts, create a 25

harmonious popular culture in Alaska.

We haven't mentioned -- heard much about the Natives of Alaska, the people of Port Graham and Nanwalek, from English Bay, who have their own style of life in Alaska. We have mainly talked about Homer, but the lease sale in question here affects Kodiak, English Bay, Seldovia, Ninilchik, the whole area, you know. And my concern is not so much the same as of the ecological representatives here. I'm not a particularly anxious otter lover and so on. In fact, I detest them slightly since they recently are eating all the clams on my beach.

My concerns are of a rather broader cultural and political nature, namely, I think we have not digested yet what the optimists, the Chamber of Commerce types, call the benefits of the last Alaska oil boom. We are still suffering from the mentality of the people that the oil boom has attracted to Alaska. And most of them have found refuge, not just in the oil industry where a lot of them are good, hard, solid workers, most of them has found refuge in the Alaskan bureaucracy.

I see no need for more revenue for Alaska, specifically since the revenue expected from that oil sale in question would create a lot of hardship, a lot of ecological and other problems. But specifically, it would create another boom mentality, a greater bureaucracy, an unhealthy social climate. We have not digested the last boom. We have not yet dealt with the negative aspects of this old oil boom. If some people want

to leave Alaska because they're not getting rich fast enough, 1 2 they are welcome to leave or adjust..... 3 (Applause) 4 .....to a simpler way of life. 5 (Applause) Sallie Dodd, followed by 6 MR. BROCK: Thank you. 7 Dayton Butters, I believe it is? 8 MS. DODD-BUTTERS: Actually, that's Sallie Dodd-9 Butters. 10 MR. BROCK: Oh, okay. 11 MS. DODD-BUTTERS: Sally with an -i-e. I wanted to thank you for your assistance 12 MR. BROCK: 13 tonight before you start. So thank you..... 14 MS. DODD-BUTTERS: Well, my pleasure. 15 MR. BROCK: ....very much. 16 MS. DODD-BUTTERS: I hope I didn't miss anybody on 17 the signatures. We want to let you know how we feel. PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. SALLIE DODD-BUTTERS 18 19 Dodd, D-o-d-d, as the Senator from Connecticut, and 20 Butters. Butters. I find it hard to believe that only a handful of 21 22 people showed up in Anchorage for your public hearing. 23 Although with executive oil jobs and only the forelands to look 24 at, well, maybe they just don't care. However, they should, 25 because that crack in Augustine is aimed right up the Inlet,

and a volcanic eruption isn't a matter of if but, rather, when.

And dealing with that natural disaster could be hard enough on
us without having a bathtub full of black death.

And as an eleventh generation American, and a 22-year resident of Homer, I came from New Jersey, the old home of John Rockefeller's Standard Oil and the new home of Rockefeller's Exxon. And while visiting New Jersey last year, I passed several miles of solar and hydro-powered vehicles going 50 miles an hour on a major highway, from one university to another. One was a 42-seat hydro-powered bus. There were very few being pulled on platforms that had failed, and they'd come from New York State. So alternative energy already exists; it just needs to be used and nurtured economically.

I lost a lot of ancestors through the centuries in fights against greedy despots and injustice, and it's not in my genes to just lay down and die of cancer or asthma so big business can get fatter.

# (Applause)

I was angry in the early '70s when this industry wanted to drill in Kachemak Bay. Gentlemen, how many of you were here in that -- those years? How many of you were here? How many even remember?

# (Applause)

Well, I remember. And I was here. And I was angry then, and I'm angrier now that I have children. I'm here for the dura-

tion, and I'm not leaving.

And I learned in a college course in behavioral statistics how statistics can be twisted, and your Environmental Impact Statement proves this one more time without a doubt.

You had better read this crowd very correctly, gentlemen. We're all getting really tired of beating our heads against your walls, and our patience is waning. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Dayton Butters, followed by Andy Sagrove -- Sangrove? Go ahead, Dave.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DAYTON BUTTERS

Hi. My name is Dayton Butters. I live at -- here in Homer, Post Office Box 1223. I hope something is making itself perfectly clear here: This town doesn't want you.

Just a minute while I put my glasses on.

(Laughter)

The scenic beauty, the rest of America that comes here to visit this place, and the animal and marine resources cannot be sacrificed to an industry that has no concern other than profits and gobbling up a resource as fast as they can with no regard to the environment, the jobs generated through fishing and tourism, or the safety of the people who live here. You will spill, over and over again, and pollute with your chemicals and drilling muds. And when you are gone, what's

1 left for us to live with? 2 I'm following the only decent advice from former 3 President Reagan: I'm saying no. No to 149. 4 (Applause) Andy S-a-n- either g-r-o-v-e or 5 MR. BROCK: 6 -a-r-o-v-e. 7 (No audible response) 8 MR. BROCK: Okay. We'll go to the next one. 9 Hillstrand. 10 (Simultaneous audience response) 11 MR. BROCK: Okay. Well, this one says Nancy, but, 12 Dave, you can follow. 13 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. NANCY HILLSTRAND 14 Hello. My name is Nancy Hillstrand, P.O. Box 170, 15 Homer, Alaska 99603. Speaking on behalf of Pioneer Alaskan 16 Fisheries, Coal Point Trading Company, and the animals of Cook 17 Inlet and Kodiak -- and the fish, of course. 18 My whole life is designed around fish, and pretty 19 much everything that I do has some aspect of fish in it. 20 raised salmon for 17 years; I now have a processing plant; we 21 fish. My husband's raised here all of his life, and five sons 22 that are also in the fishing industry. And we all say, the 20 23 of us, say no to this Lease Sale 149.

Out in Cook Inlet here is a humongous gyre, and in

that gyre is where all the larva collects for the king crab,

24

shrimp, clams, scallops. It's an extremely abundant place.
But along with all the larva and all the life, we'll also
collect all of the drilling muds, any type of a spill. Any
type of pollutant will go down into that gyre and be surrounding all of these larva.

In the Copper River, there's a gyre right off of -offshore there, and the Minerals Management Service canceled
the sales because of this gyre. I'm asking you gentlemen to
cancel this sale because of our gyres. We have a number of
gyres, actually.

The currents in this area cannot sustain a spill. Do you think we have forgotten what happened in 1989? I've been tormented from seeing the otters gouging their eyes out and chewing their fingers off from when I went to Prince William Sound on a boat at the beginning of the spill, and it haunts me to this day. And I do not want to see it happen again here. I can't stand to happen -- for it to happen again. I don't really know what I'll do, to tell you the truth. I don't think that I'd be able to handle it.

I was so deeply distressed over what happened during the spill, as was everyone else in this town, that I really think you'd better listen to what we are saying. Listen very, very carefully because I don't think we can handle it again. I don't think our souls, our minds, and our spirits can handle another spill.

We're continually hearing, on the radio, in the papers, of drilling muds, of hydrocarbons, of pollution in Alaska. It doesn't make any sense to me at all. I just don't think that we can be bought off, as maybe some people can, and I really hope that you will listen, as I say. I've talked at a lot of different meetings. I've seen that people don't listen, and I think it's time that the citizens are listened to in this effect.

Under the oil -- under the ocean in upper Cook Inlet there's a pipeline, and during the spill, we found that those -- some of those were frozen -- would be frozen open so that if they tried to shut them down and shut the oil off, there's no way that they'd be able to shut the oil off if a major catastrophe such as an earthquake or a volcano went off. In fact, what precipitated that was the Drift River problem when the volcano blew. And with that kind of -- with no money, number one, and with all of these old pipelines under the ocean, we're just waiting for another problem to happen.

I was here in 1974 with the leases in Kachemak Bay, coming to the same meetings over and over again. I don't know why we have to keep going through this. With the George Ferris in the bay, and, you know, it's just -- it's like you're tormenting us. And with all the money that's put into all these books and all this paper and all this waste, I just think it really has to stop. But the problem is, you're not listening.

1.5

And I'm asking you to listen because you need to listen to the people because we are America. And we are the people that are the government, and you work for us, and it's important that everyone realizes where we all stand.

My family has 10 grandchildren in it right now. One within another -- most of them, within another 10 to 15 years, they will have great-grandchildren. There's been four generations of Hillstrands in Alaska, and they've all been in the fishing industry. Interesting. So please don't take this from us. We had to sit on the beach during 1989, and we don't want to sit on the beach again. We hire 25 people at our business right now in Homer, and without any fish, you've destroyed the lives of 25 families that work for us. That's just one small, tiny business in the town of Homer.

I hope that you'll look into the gyres and the currents and realize the life that they hold and that what spills will go into them. And again, as I said before, please, please do not let this go through. From here all the way to False Pass would be affected by any disasters, and we know there will be one. And there is no way that we can get the oil up with the weather that we have here in the Cook Inlet. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DAVID HILLSTRAND

My name is David Hillstrand, H-i-l-l-s-t-r-a-n-d.

2.2

Live at 1040 Bell Avenue, Box 1500, Homer, Alaska. I was born in Homer, Alaska, here. I've lived here all my life, except for three years in high school in the states. I later returned, and I've lived here all my life. I've fished mostly for my income, and I've done charters in the recent last two years.

We are an oil-user group, and we're dependent on oil for our livelihoods, and I do enjoy cheap oil. But I'd be willing to pay for it and sacrifice and do without some things to ensure the protection of this ecosystem and the economy here.

I have friends who work in the oil industry, and I know they need jobs, too. So somewhere you need to find the balance in all this. Most of them are willing to travel to other places and to work other areas. And so I don't know how affected they would be if this sale was blocked and, you know, if they'd be allowed to work in other nations or other places like that. But I'm sure they would be willing to travel to other areas and work.

One of the things you mentioned was the test on sea life. I don't know where you tested this sea life, how far below the rigs that you tested it, probably down here in Cook Inlet on the clams, maybe on some crab. But I know those tests are in parts per million, and you have a tolerance there, that it can be up to so many parts per million, but then if it

doesn't hit the certain mark, it's not dangerous. But that's a deviation there or something that should be looked at real carefully.

These rigs are 40 to 50 miles north of this area that you're proposing, 60 to 100 miles south of that area, so we're talking a 150-mile area. Also, this area up north is silty, mud, fast moving currents, so any tests done on the water up there would have filtered out these parts by the time they got down here. When you start drilling in the area down here where there's clean water, where there's an abundant resource -- the larva, the candlefish, the capelin, all the food sources, for the halibut moving in shallow that feed, the whales come in here to feed. This is a real critical habitat. There's nurseries for crab and for the flatfish off the bluffs and things like that.

One of the things you did mention was over-fishing. We are our own worst enemy, and we have over-fished our stocks, but we're trying to rebuild those stocks. If you were to have an oil spill happen on top of over-harvesting -- and that's another battle we are trying to fight right now through another council, and so that's in its own battle right there. But if you add an oil spill on top of it, it would be catastrophic.

I have seen cod from doing charters -- I don't know what kind of -- it's a cancerous sore I've seen on them. I don't know if it's caused from a parasite or whatever. I don't

know if it's caused from the oil. Most likely a parasite.

Also, too, it's been talked about: Save it; it'll be there for future years. It's like a bank account. It's -- and people mentioned it for our children. There's a mandate -- it sounds pretty much like there's a mandate to explore and to find the oil. And I don't know if we're going to be able to stop you. Is that a mandate for the military purposes, as the one gentleman mentioned? But if we -- if you do tests, we'll find out if we have it, but use it as a tool, you know, and save it.

And is it for more pollution and more dependence upon oil? We definitely need to try to get as far away from dependence upon oil or being out of the scenario of being -- with the Far East putting the pressure upon us as a nation.

Does our voice really mean anything? I've been through the public process, and I've heard the public say no to something, and I've seen the councils and high government officials go against what the people say. And that's a scary thing to see in the United States of America. I don't know. It sounds like we're going through the system here, and you're just listening to us. I really hope that you have balanced thinking in this and prevail in sound judgment.

You're moving, also, the oil from the ground. One of the last things that touched my thoughts was -- and that what you're pumping back in is water and mud to fill this void back

up, I think. It's what I've heard in the past. I think that that oil acts as a cushion or a shock absorber for the earth moving and things like that.

And in 1964 when we had the quake, it really messed things up. What will happen in the future years when we have more earthquakes and we don't have that cushion? I don't even know if that is true or not, what I'm saying here, but it's just a thought I've had. Maybe you should — it'd be interesting to check into it. Maybe we do need that cushion to absorb the shock of the earth moving and things like that.

I'm definitely against the sale of -- and the lease of the oil in this area. The only portion I would give you is the very upper portion, the northern Shelikof area. When you go to Kodiak, that's another prime tanner crab grounds. You're probably going to find oil in these areas, too, because animals are cre- -- or the oil has been created from animals being smashed underneath large amounts of dirt.

And I know there's lots of crab and sea life in these areas that you're trying to get to, but you're going to -- you need to do it -- and if you do it -- what you do cannot affect other people. You can do whatever you want to do, but it's -- when it starts affecting other people's lives, you need to really think about it and ask yourself, Is it worth it?

So thank you for your time.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

### (Applause)

MR. BROCK: McNamara? I believe they -- oh, you didn't mark your name back off?

(No audible response)

MR. BROCK: Okay. I couldn't tell by this asterisk whether it was asterisked and then taken off or not.

MR. McNAMARA: No. I'm here.

MR. BROCK: Okay.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. PATRICK MCNAMARA

I'm Patrick McNamara, P.O. Box 2672, Homer, Alaska.

I oppose Lease Sale 149. The recent news of the 800 or so violations in upper Cook Inlet and over 4,200 violations of the Clean Water Act in the last eight years by the oil platforms and companies is reason and proof enough for me to oppose this lease sale. But other reasons exist.

This involves lower Cook Inlet. I can see it from my house. The eventual violations and spills from the rigs or pipelines or tankers will show up in some form on my beaches, along with the wildlife that is, in my mind, guaranteed to wash up on my beaches in some form -- slicked up.

Also, manmade devices -- platforms and such -- are vulnerable to the volcanoes and earthquakes that will occur. In the winter weather, it is icy, windy, and freezing and dark, and any spill or any damaged tanker will be stranded, and any chance of cleanup will be hindered, if any takes place.

Thanks.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Emily Johngren, followed by Libby Bushell.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. EMILY JOHNGREN

My name is Emily Johngren, P.O. Box 2672, Homer, Alaska. And I'm here representing myself.

What I have read of the EIS and what I have learned in general terrifies me. Oil Lease Sale 149 is and will continue to harm me personally. It will destroy the environment and our renewable industries, and it will prevent us from moving on to renewable, cleaner sources of energy.

Ever since I found out about Oil Lease Sale 149, I have had trouble sleeping. I have been anxious and sad. My anger and distress of the oil industry and government have grown, and they are making me feel completely helpless. This will continue if the lease sale becomes reality, and I know other people are suffering in this way.

The Clean Water Act disturbs me because it allows industry to pollute our waters to a certain extent, and still the oil industry violates the Act. The oil companies don't respect the environment, and they try to get away with all the pollution they can. The more drilling muds, cuttings, and produced waters that are dumped, the more that toxins like

radium, cadmium, and benzene will be accumulating in the animals and plants and ourselves.

The EIS never seems to mention what effect exploration and development will have on the immediate areas. For example, in a section about flare emissions, they say the effect on shore will be minimal because the emissions will have dispersed by then. What about the water and its inhabitants under the flares?

Also, we have a number of communities that rely on subsistence, which will be threatened by the increased pollution from normal oil development as well as from the guaranteed small spills and the great chance of larger spills. We have five national wildlife refuges, a number of parks and preserves, and critical habitat areas. We should be doing everything to protect them. The lease sale is inconsistent with this protection.

How will the companies defend themselves from a major earthquake and a volcano eruption? How can the oil industries prevent destruction of damage (sic) from those -- destruction or damage from those natural occurrences? They certainly will not be able to adequately or quickly clean up the spill, especially during a storm or where there is ice.

This area is still recovering from the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and this lease sale threatens that recovery. The EIS belittles the adverse effects that exploration and develop-

ment will surely have on endangered and threatened species, as well as non-endangered species. And their facts seem to depend on voluntary compliance from oil companies. Oil companies will only do what costs the least.

With the adverse effects on commercial fisheries, the EIS discusses space use conflicts, but also mentions a 15- to 65-percent economic loss from an oil spill. Of course, this adversely affects fishermen and canneries. The EIS does not mention what unavoidable adverse effects there would be on Homer's tourism industry. Fishing and tourism are Homer's main sustainable economies. An oil industry will conflict with them.

The Minerals Management Service may say that talking about renewable energy sources is beyond the scope of this hearing, but I disagree. If we had renewable sources in place, we would not be here tonight. We would not be dependent on oil so much that you would be calling oil a vital part of national security. If anything, this utter dependence on oil is a threat to national security. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Libby Bushell?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the Bushells have gone

home.

MR. BROCK: Rachel Adams, followed by Eric Ranger?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ringer.

MR. BROCK: Ringer?

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. RACHEL ADAMS

Hi. My name is Rachel Adams, and I live in the Hidden Hills. My address is P.O. Box 2188, Homer, Alaska. And I'm here representing myself and my friends and most of the lower Kenai Peninsula.

I want to thank you for coming this evening to hear us out. I hope you had a chance to see the beautiful sunset over the Inlet tonight.

Lease Sale 149 is a mistake we cannot afford to make. Lease Sale 149 borders on five national wildlife refuges and four national parks and preserves. We have one of the most valuable ecosystems in the world here on the lower Kenai Peninsula. Before we stick oil platforms in the lower Cook Inlet, we need to examine and focus on 827 incidents of dumping sewage in the upper Cook Inlet. Let us learn from our mistakes, please.

Stop thinking about money, money, money, and think about yourselves, your children, and your grandchildren. Think about the future. Lease Sale 149 is a mistake we cannot afford to make. And in closing, I want to thank the kids who stepped up to this microphone tonight. It is wonderful, maybe a little scary, to see a 12-year-old girl step up here and teach you, her elders, the reason why Lease 149 is a mistake, a big

mistake. And that little girl gives me a lot more hope than the government ever has.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Eric Riner -- Ringer, followed by Steve R-u-z-a-n-s-k-i.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. ERIC RINGER

Hi. My name is Eric Ringer, R-i-n-g-e-r. My address is Box 1072, Homer. And I'm representing myself, my wife, and my daughter.

I'm a local restaurant owner and a former member of the Homer City Council and the Port and Harbor Commission. And I am opposed to Lease Sale 149, and I would ask for you gentlemen to recommend that it be canceled.

Homer's economy, as everyone has mentioned, is based on tourism and fishing, and those of us involved in that industry do not feel that oil development is compatible with that. When I was on the City Council, the City did numerous public forums in the area as to what the people thought of development in the future for Homer. Oil development was overwhelmingly disapproved. The majority of people did not feel that that was compatible with what they wanted to see happen in the Homer area.

I was on the Council during the Exxon Valdez oil spill and certainly do not want to repeat that experience. Though Homer itself was minimally oiled, the effect on the

community socially was catastrophic. People are still recovering, both economically and mentally, I believe, from that.

Future oil development would create growth problems with -- by bringing more people to the area, necessitating the infrastructure of sewer, water, et cetera, which would probably increase tax burden in the area.

Some of the history I've had with oil is I got to Homer in 1976 on the very day that the George Ferris, which was an oil rig that was parked in Kachemak Bay, got swamped by a tide. Now, that was an oil spill of only -- I think it was around 600 gallons of diesel fuel. But it just goes to show that the unexpected can certainly happen. And while that was a small spill, it could be a lot larger spill if the rig had actually tipped over instead of just being swamped.

Another experience I have, when I was commercial fishing, I believe it was in 1979, there was a drill ship anchored in lower Cook Inlet between Augustine and the Barren Islands. And we fished around them all winter, and they basically got thrashed. We talked to them; they actually drilled about four days out of the month. At one time, the ship almost rolled over due to heavy icing conditions and heavy sea conditions. And after that winter, they didn't come back. They did not like the lower Cook Inlet.

It's a very treacherous area. It's not like the upper Inlet where you just have tide and ice. The weather

б

conditions are horrid, and the drilling area is much deeper than the upper Inlet.

As we found in the numerous oil spills that have happened, both in Cook Inlet and with the Exxon Valdez, cleaning up oil just doesn't seem to work. Oil booms don't work in anything less than slack tide and no waves. Those conditions very rarely exist in the lower Cook Inlet; you almost always have a strong tide and almost always have large wave action.

I would ask you to listen to the people in Homer.

This is the area that will be most affected by Lease Sale 149.

And I would ask you to recommend that it be canceled. Thank

you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Steve....

MR. RUZANSKI: Ruzanski.

MR. BROCK: ....Ruzanski, and followed by Kent Castner.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. STEVE RUZANSKI

That's R-u-z-a-n-s-k-i. Okay. And my address is 2 -- Box 255, Homer.

I'm a newcomer to Homer, and like most people in the room, the first glance across the water over the bay and Inlet was an absolutely awesome display of beauty. Though I haven't as yet taken advantage of much of what's in store in terms of

wildlife, fishing, and other outdoorsy stuff, I have witnessed an awesome display of a different kind of wildlife -- the human kind. Homer's people is what I speak of, a community filled with wild-spirited people who love this beautiful little corner of the world and who care about the quality of life for themselves and every other creature who lives here.

Lease 149, around here, is an endangered species. I urge that the MMS hear the voices that you hear in this hall tonight and send 149 down the road to extinction. It would be -- if 149 passes -- excuse me -- it would be one in a long series of human tragedies. Homer and its people will never be the same, another community's heart broken. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Ken Castner.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. KEN CASTNER

My name is Ken Castner, C-a-s-t-n-e-r. My winter address is P.O. Box 558, Homer. In the summertime, I spend my time between lower Cook Inlet and a fish camp in upper Cook Inlet directly across from Nikiski.

We're now five years from the signing date of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, five years into a 15-year period where the oil companies are supposed to be progressing into double-hulled tankers. Today there is not one single architect, naval architect, in the United States that has the designs of a

double-hulled tanker in front of him.

The oil companies have not moved into double-hulled tankers and will do so only at the very last minute, probably about 10 years from now. As the tankers are coming up, they're just putting them -- they're just beaching them. They're -- when their time is up within this 15-year phase-out period, they're retiring them from the United States' service.

I don't believe that the oil companies of the world are ready for a sale in lower Cook Inlet. A year and a half ago I had the opportunity to meet with the Secretary of Interior, and at that time, he was a little bit sheepish about having to have oil sales anywhere. These are definitely not offers that anyone in the United States really care to receive. The people of Florida definitely don't want to have any OCS development. And the people of California definitely don't. And the people, generally, of Alaska don't either. And mostly it's because of the record of the oil companies.

My involvement with the Cook Inlet RCAC, I've spent literally hundreds of hours sitting around the table with oil people, and not only here in Alaska but in Washington, D.C., and abroad. And there's one commonality, and that is, is that they dictate the terms. They tell you exactly what they want to do, how they want to do it, when they're going to do it, and they expect to be able to do that.

Well, it's a new day and age, and it's time for us to

dictate the terms on how we're going to allow these folks to come in and develop these resources.

(Applause)

At \$17.22 a barrel, it's not going to be any time soon. They are not going to be able to come in here and do -- develop lower Cook Inlet the way lower Cook Inlet has to be developed, and spend the money that it's going to take to mitigate the way that they need to mitigate.

Other people have spoken about the inability to pick up oil in seas of above six feet. It's just a non-entity. There's no response for an oil spill there. But beyond that, there's the prevention side of things where the folks in upper Cook Inlet won't even replace an old mud boat that they use for their primary response vessel and put in an up-to-date omnidirectional tractor tug because it's going to cost them an extra million bucks a year.

We're really caught in a position here in lower Cook Inlet where, because there's production in upper Cook Inlet, the Secretary feels like, 'Well, I've got to come up with something in the United States so that the next -- in the election two years from now, this Administration isn't accused of having not had any oil development in the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States.' But it's not an appropriate event.

I'll tell you what: You guys can all come back, but

before you do come back, why don't you ring us up and we'll 1 2 tell you what our conditions are. And when you can write an EIS and you can write a development plan that meet the condi-3 tions of the folks that live here, and make us believe that 4 it's going to be developed in a safe way, in a prudent way, in 5 6 a way that meets all the concerns that you've here tonight, 7 then you can come back, and we'll have a lovely discussion. Thank you. 8 9 MR. BROCK: Thank you. 10 (Applause) Wendy Breiby. I was on the list after 11 MS. BREIBY: Steve Ruzanski? 12 13 MR. BROCK: Wendy who? What's your name? 14 MS. BREIBY: Wendy Breiby. Breiby? After Steve who? 15 MR. BROCK: Ruzanski. 16 MS. BREIBY: MR. BROCK: 17 Oh, you didn't have a star. I'm sorry. 1.8 MS. BREIBY: I thought I did, but, yeah. 19 MR. BROCK: Oh, okay. You're -- go -- yes, I have 20 passed your name, but you didn't have a star, but you're.... MS. BREIBY: 21 You're right. 22 MR. BROCK: .....welcome to go ahead. 23 MS. BREIBY: Thank you. 24 Please spell your name. MR. BROCK:

MS. BREIBY: W-e-n-d-y B-r-e-i-b-y.

# 

\_\_

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. WENDY BREIBY

My P.O. Box is number 255 in Homer. I am definitely opposed to Lease Sale 149 and any other lease sale in any other part of the world. I'm new to Alaska, but what is happening here affects me just as much as the destruction happening in the rest of the world. Not only will this be devastating to this area but also to the rest of the world.

In fact, the reason I came here was to find a place where life still exists, where people care about life on earth, where life is more important than the almighty dollar. In this area, I've found much life and a wonderful community of concerned citizens. I cringe at the idea of a day where our children don't know what animals, trees, or any other life form are, a day where all of our surroundings are polluted and dead. The world will not survive on pollutants alone. In fact, we can't survive on pollutants at all.

If this day arrives, I guess you people can say that you were part of taking care of the population problem. I can only feel compassion for you people who are so caught up in money, power, and ownership that you fail to see the importance of such an ecosystem of life on earth, and that you will never feel the peace of mind as we feel when we're out in the wild with all its life. I know that until you understand what's around you will you be able to respect and appreciate it.

As long as the oil and gas industry and other big

_	
1	industry have power, alternative energies, which we know and
2	they know exist, will stay hidden on the back burner. We don't
3	need another drop of oil. I don't believe that you would
4	continue oil and gas production anywhere, and especially not in
5	an area still recovering from the devastating Exxon Valdez
6	spill, and where there is any life, especially the life that is
7	fighting to keep their species alive. I don't even want half
8	of a percent of life to be affected. Thank you.
9	MR. BROCK: Thank you.
10	(Applause)
11	MR. BROCK: Robert Halpin?
12	(Inaudible comment)
13	MR. BROCK: Looks H-a-l-p-i-n, Post Office Box
14	1051, Homer.
15	(No audible response)
16	MR. BROCK: Peggy Kleinbder, K-l-i K-l-e-i-n-b-
17	d-e-r?
18	(Indiscernible audience response)
19	MR. BROCK: Okay.
20	PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. PEGGY KLEINLEDER
21	I'm Peggy Kleinleder. That's K-l-e-i-n-l-e-d-e-r.
22	MR. BOUDREAU: That's too fast.
23	BY MS. KLEINLEDER (Resuming):
24	I'm sorry. K-l-e-i-n-l-e-d-e-r. Post Office Box
25	367, Homer. I'm representing myself and my family.

all my life. My husband and I and our two children have made our home in Homer for the past seven years. I see no logic in pursuing development of Alaska's few remaining oil fields now. It is possible that in the distant future our children or grandchildren will decide that the risks of permanent damage to wildlife populations and the environment is worth the temporary economic and energy gain from development of the limited oil resources. Let's leave that decision to them. We have no right to deplete and jeopardize the environment that their future survival depends on.

I oppose Oil Lease Sale 149. I've lived in Alaska

We need to begin today to make the sacrifices involved in shifting the emphasis from fossil fuels to conservation and renewable resources. We must protect our precious fisheries and tourism industries.

My husband and children are involved in the Shore Bird Sister Schools project in which school children in the Lower 48 and in Alaska monitor the migration of shore birds up the West Coast from South America to their breeding grounds in the Arctic. Mud Bay, here in Kachemak Bay, has been identified by the Western Hemisphere Shore Bird Reserve Network as one of the habitat locations that is essential for maintaining the health of the world population of shore birds. The migrating birds and whales of Kachemak Bay are precious to citizens of many countries. We have no right to jeopardize the environment

that supports these world treasures.

Imagine that you were planning to have elective surgery and that the surgeon told you that their techniques for sterilizing the instruments were not fully developed and that there would be a 100-percent chance of you getting hepatitis and a 72-percent chance of you getting AIDS. Let's not subject our oceans to those odds. Thank vou.

> MR. BROCK: Thank you.

> > (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Jonathan? Oh. Welcome.

Thank you. MASTER KLEINLEDER:

MR. BROCK: Let me see if I can get that down a little lower for you. There we go.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MASTER JONATHAN ALLEN KLEINLEDER

My name is Jonathan Allen Kleinleder, and my mom just went up. I'm the same address as my mom.

I'm against the oil sale because it can kill many animals. The animals are depending on us because that this is their habitat. Many of us want to stop the oil sale -- lease sale. We are using a lot of tenacity to save the animals and their habitat. Oil and Homer don't mix. Cancel Lease Sale 149.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

I'm not on the list, but I have to go, MS. BUTTERS:

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

so I'm just going to do this now. Okay?

MR. BROCK: Pardon me?

MS. BUTTERS: I'm not on the list, but I have to go, so I'm just going to do this now.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. KIMA BUTTERS

Okay. My name is Kima Butters, and my address is P.O. ....

MR. BROCK: Would you spell your last name?
BY MS. BUTTERS (Resuming):

Oh, I'm sorry. Kima, K-i-m-a, and Butters, B-u-t-t-e-r-s. And my address is P.O. Box 1223, Homer.

I'm here tonight, as is everyone else, to express my strong opposition to the Sale Lease 149. I was born in Homer and have lived here for 17 years and am proud to call it home. I plan to travel after graduating but know I'll be back. This land is too beautiful to stay away. I want to be able to come back and see it as beautiful as when I left. And I want my future children to see and understand why they, too, must unfortunately keep a constant vigil against those who would try to take places like this away.

The oil and gas companies have to start looking beyond today's dollars and ahead to tomorrow's losses. Progress is one thing; blatant greed is another. Those running the oil companies just don't care. They don't have to; they don't live here. When the oil's gone, they'll move on, leaving us

with the death and destruction. That's all we have to show for this.

We are here tonight with a clear message: We love our home the way it is. And to the Lease Sale 149, we say with absolute conviction, We don't want it.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Bremicker, B-r-e-m-i-c-k-e-r, followed by Jennifer Edwards.

(Pause - Whispered conversations)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. RICHARD "BUMPPO" BREMICKER

Good evening. My name is Bumppo Bremicker,

Richard -- usually known as Bumppo. I've been a resident of
the Kachemak Bay area for 25 years. I'm a commercial fisherman
and a charter boat captain. I've raised three children in this
area, one who has also worked as a commercial fisherman and
charter boat deckhand.

I and my family, as everyone in this area, is, to some degree, dependent on the fish and wildlife and scenic beauty we have all around us. I'd like to put up this marine chart showing some of the resources of lower Cook Inlet and areas of their abundance. So I have this chart here, and it covers most of the area of the lease sale, just south of Kalgin Island down here.

Thanks, Eddie. Here.

1

2

# (Side comments)

Yeah, there we go. Okay. So I wanted to show you quys this chart. It -- like I say, it doesn't go quite as far down south -- past Cape Douglas as the lease area, but it covers most of it. These are some of the resources that I know I'm a commer- -- like I said, I'm a commercial fisherman, charter boat captain, so I've been all over this area. And other people, too, that I've talked to have helped add things on this.

10 11

12

13

9

And there's -- if you'll look at this, this is just a bare minimum of the things that are around. I mean, we could write a lot of these names all over this chart. There's herring fishing across Kamishak. There's herring in Chulitna Bay, herring up in Tuxedni Bay. All those spawn on the beaches, and, you know, oil would affect that big time, like it has in

14 15

Prince William Sound.

16 17

18

19

20

Down the middle of the Inlet we have, of course, salmon fishing, the drift fleet. We have the halibut fishing, the charter boat halibut fishing. We -- all over the Inlet we have cod just about everywhere. There's otters, there's winter king fishing off the bluff. It just goes on and on. And there's clam beds all along this side of the Inlet, razor clam beds.

21 22 23

24

25

I haven't read the whole EIS, but from what I understand, there isn't any mention of razor clams in there.

mention intertidal organisms and low-energy beaches or something. Well, these are high-energy beaches. The razor clam beds are famous all over Alaska and probably the world, and those would be tremendously affected by any oil spills. And we have, you know, Kachemak Bay full of stuff -- king crab, tanner crab, otters, kelp beds, besides all the smaller organisms that feed everything.

I drew in one of the gyres, as been mentioned, the gyres that are so critical to this whole area. Here's one of them here. This one here. This is one; there's other ones over in Kamishak, too. These areas, this whole idea of the Inlet flushing out, you know, I've fished halibut for many, many years in the Inlet, and in the old days when we used to actually be able to sleep at night and fish halibut, when it got dark, we just turned the engine off and we'd just drift. And you'd drift up and down, and you'd end up, usually, in about the same place you started. You didn't get flushed out of Cook Inlet. You know, everything stays here. This is a myth that it flushes out.

And so all this stuff ends up here mixing up and fe- -- and getting into the whole ecosystem. So we got bears, of course, over here. There are brown bears over here in Kamishak, foxes. I think it goes on -- whales. People -- you know, there's whales all around the Inlet. See whales all the time, you go out there and charter fish. This is one of the

big things that people love to see, of course, is the whales --1 gray whales, fin whales, minke whales, orca whales, beluga 2 3 whales. They're all over the place. There's just -- you know. And this -- so I'm going 4 to turn this in to you. And, of course, I've got the view 5 marked here. The view is critical, too, of course, all over 6 the place. So I'm going to give this chart to you, and maybe 7 8 you can -- guys can take a good close look at it. And sometime today I'd love to take you out there and see it close-hand, if 9

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you. One moment.

MR. BREMICKER: Excuse me. Yeah.

MR. BOUDREAU: I neither caught your name because you spoke it too fast.....

MR. BREMICKER: Okay.

MR. BOUDREAU: ....or I don't know how to spell it.

MR. BREMICKER: Okay. Well, I'll tell you what.

It's Bumppo, B-u-m-p-p-o, Bremicker, B-r-e-m-i-c-k-e-r. And I'm a resident of Fritz Creek. But I've got a few more things to say. I just wanted to show you -- give you this chart.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

MR. BREMICKER: Thank you.

(Pause - Side comments)

BY MR. BREMICKER (Resuming):

you haven't already.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2
 3

And so like I say, I love this area. I fully intend to live here the rest of my life and will do whatever is in my power to protect the ecosystem that supports myself, my family, and my community. Oil and gas production poses too great a risk to this area. Our economy is based on the natural beauty of Cook Inlet and Kachemak Bay. Oil rigs, even if they were non-polluting, would interfere with that natural beauty.

I have seen and participated in the demise of many commercial fisheries in the past 25 years. King crab, tanner crab, dungeness crab, pink shrimp, pot shrimp, clams, and salmon. I'm sure that our greed as fishermen is partly responsible for this. But I also know that animals, such as barnacles and sea urchins and sea anemones, are not as numerous in the tide pools my children grew up watching as they once were. I suspect chronic pollution from 25 years of oil drilling and dumping of drilling muds into Cook Inlet may be the cause.

And if the small creatures of the tide pools are being killed, so are the plankton forms of crab and shrimp that make up the great soup that is stirred by the tides of Cook Inlet. Contrary to the dreams of the oil companies that pollution is okay in Cook Inlet because it is flushed out twice a day like a giant toilet, the chronic dumping of pollutants from drilling and boat discharges get trapped in the gyres that are critical to the sea life and our lives.

The EIS study that the government has obviously spent

such large amounts of money on is a good thing in itself. The more understanding of the ecology of Cook Inlet, the better. It's about time we make a continuing study of the effects the oil industry has had, and is having, on this area. But in spite of all the statistics and graphs and interesting information contained in the study, the real heart of the matter is missing. That is, Why risk something as productive and beautiful as Cook Inlet and the communities it supports to make a few outsiders rich and maybe pump a few more gallons of gas for our cars?

Yes, I drove here tonight, and probably some of my clothes are made from oil products. But that doesn't mean I don't wish for alternatives or that we have to ruin one of the entire world's natural treasures to get at a little more oil. The people here tonight are trying to tell you what I heard Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros, on the National Press Club say the other day on the radio, that the people who live in an area know what's best for them. What you see tonight is true democracy in action.

The oil company executives who want to drill in.....

(Off record)

(Tape Change - Tape No. 4 of 5)

(On record)

BY MR. BREMICKER (Continuing):

.....Louisiana, Texas, and upper Cook Inlet. We're not going

2.2

to let them do it here. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Jennifer Edwards, followed by Allison Teague, I believe it is.

MS. TOBIESSEN: My name isn't Jennifer Edwards. She told me that she had to leave early and that she left you a letter, but if you don't mind, I'd like to speak instead of Jennifer.

MR. BROCK: Okay.

MS. TOBIESSEN: My name is Sonja Tobiessen.

MR. BROCK: Spell it.

MS. TOBIESSEN: S-o-n-j-a T-o-b-i-e-s-s-e-n.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. SONJA TOBIESSEN

I live at the end of Fireweed Avenue and receive my mail at Box 3522 in Homer. And I am representing myself and future generations of Cook Inlet.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to those of the MMS willing to listen regarding Federal Lease Sale 149, which I strongly oppose. I have lived here on Kachemak Bay for over 12 years and have earned a living primarily on the water commercially fishing. Management of the fishing resources is far from a perfected science in this part of the world, but it will possibly become a moot point with little left to manage if oil and gas development be given the opportunity to expand even

further south in Cook Inlet.

2.2

With the thousands of documented discharge violations on record committed by the oil companies in Cook Inlet over the last eight years, it seems to me they have not earned the privilege to expand their domain and will not until they can prove to those of us who live here that they are responsible by practicing zero discharge.

It is an established fact that fossil fuels are a finite resource. I've heard oil officials' estimates that there are only a few months' worth of oil at the present domestic use level within these 2 million acres we're speaking of. It hardly seems worth the potential damage to the water of Cook Inlet and the life that depends on this water to drill here. I'd be interested to know how soon the MMS will respond to the need of this country to allow the use of petroleum to fade gracefully into history as an early and crude attempt to provide energy for this planet.

Others tonight have pointed out the seismic instability of this area; the treacherous weather, currents, and ice of Cook Inlet; and the protected refuges and critical habitat areas bordering the proposed lease sale area. Those factors, not to mention the extent to which we depend on the Inlet for our livelihoods, seem reason enough to cancel Lease Sale 149.

I resent having to testify once again against yet another oil lease sale. The people of Bristol Bay have pre-

vented oil drilling in their bioregion. We have prevented oil drilling here in the past, and I hope to the Great Spirit that we do it again now and that you honor our request to release this lease sale. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

Homer.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Allison Teague, followed by Margi Blanding.

MS. TEAGUE: Hi. Allison Teague, P.O. Box 3912,

MR. BROCK: T-e-a-u-....

MS. TEAGUE: T-e-a-g-u-e.

MR. BROCK: T-e-a-g-u-e.

MS. TEAGUE: Right.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. ALLISON TEAGUE

I'm here representing myself and my friends and their children and my six nieces and nephews who have never been to Alaska, and I hope that they will.

My home is on the bluff overlooking Cook Inlet. And since I found out about Oil Lease Sale 149, I've had trouble sleeping at night for fear that when I wake up in the morning, even the tankers that go by will somehow have caused a spill. And the thought of having rigs out there is a nightmare, literally. I came here because of the aesthetic quality of the environment. I'm an artist, and I appreciate that more than

anything else. I've traveled around the world, and I know that this is one of the most beautiful spots and worth every effort to preserve it.

I personally believe that everything on this planet and in the universe is connected and that what we do here affects every other person, thing, atom, wave throughout this planet and the universe. I feel very strongly, from a philosophical point of view and from a spiritual point of view, that oil is the detritus of the plant. It is the feces of the planet. We should have left it alone. We should have let it stay where it was.

This can be the beginning. This can be the start of the change of showing that we can truly evolve to greater beings than we've shown so far on this planet. We have a grave responsibility to the future generations of any human being on this planet. Environmental sciences dealing with geology say that this planet is an endangered planet. That makes us an endangered species. How can we allow something like Oil Lease Sale 149 to go ahead?

This is a new era. It's time to change. There are alternative energies out there and designs in places that we have only to take advantage of that will provide the same economic benefits to people. It will give people jobs, et cetera, et cetera. There are other things. We don't need to pursue this any longer.

This is the end of the road, and I say it's the end of the line for oil. No on Oil Lease Sale 149.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Margi Blanding, followed by Michael Scott.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MARGI BLANDING

Hi. My name is Margi Blanding, M-a-r-g-i, B as in Boy, -l-a-n-d-i-n-g. I also live in Homer, P.O. Box 3355.

Most of what I, too, was going to say tonight is -has been said. I, too, am a supporter of Alternative 2. I
would not like to see oil happening in lower Cook Inlet.

It may be somewhat easy for you here to leave tonight and say, 'Well, that's Homer, and Homer's known as a bit of a radical town, an environmentalist town,' but I, too, had that problem. Is it just me? Do I just want to protect my back yard? Is it just that I don't want to look at the oil rigs?

And I wasn't happy with that because I want to share the responsibility with the rest of the world.

But I took a look around, and I looked through
your -- through the Environmental Impact Statement, and I
wanted to find some support for how I feel, and I did. It was
right there. And I blew it up on the wall, and it's your
map -- and I don't know which page it is. I can't find it.
But that was the evidence that I needed, that and there's a
couple of statements in your Environmental Impact Statement.

Ouote:

"The coast in the proposed Sale 149 area and the marine environment offshore contain some of the most beautiful shore and ocean features in the world."

Across from that quote is this map right over there.

I've colored it in; I've enhanced it a little bit.

And you guys probably know this map real well. We all know
this map real well. All those colored-in areas are the
national parks and preserves and the state parks around. The
critical areas are not colored in there because I don't know
where they all are; there's a lot of them. But what I noticed
when I looked at that map is that that's a lot of area. And
that Oil Lease Sale Area 149 is smack dab in the middle of
them. For me, what those lands mean is that this area is
important. It's not just me that thinks so.

Surrounding Oil Lease Sale Area 149 is Katmai National Park, Lake Clark National Park, Kenai Fjords, Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge — you know them all. I'm not going to go through them all. McNeil River State Game Park and lots of important areas, important areas from the national standpoint, important areas from the state standpoint, and important areas from the local standpoint.

So it's not just Homerites that are saying, 'We don't

want it here.' It's not just Homerites that are saying lower Cook Inlet is an important area. It's the nation, and that's a national treasure right there. People have fought to have that preserved, and we have no right in threatening it. The whole nation needs to know that national parks may well be in danger.

The Environmental Impact Statement says -- itself says that there is indeed going to be pollution if there is oil development, and there is going to be spills if there is oil development. That's not a question. The question is, Is it worth it?

There's a second thing for me that is real important as far as the oil and gas lease sale goes, and you've seen that here tonight, how strong the community is. The community of Homer is real strong, and it's nice to see people come out like this. In the last four days some of us were concerned that maybe Homer didn't know about this meeting, and so we were kind of silly about that. But -- 'cause everyone seemed to know. So a petition started going around, and in four days, this petition gained, it looks like about 500 signatures. And I will pass this along to Director Gottlieb and with a count of how many.

And all these people are opposed to Oil Lease Sale

149, not just, well, partially opposed, or we'd like to see it
only in this area or that area. These people are opposed to
any oil drilling happening in lower Cook Inlet. They're sup-

portive of Alternative 2.

I also think that Alternative 2 would be the only sound environmental choice, and I know that's what your job is, so I hope you pass that word along to those who need to hear it. Thank you very much.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Michael Scott, followed by Megan Corazza.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MICHAEL SCOTT

Hello. My name's Michael Scott, and I live at 667
West Fairview, Apartment C, Homer, Alaska. I haven't lived
there very long; I'm a newcomer to Alaska. And I suppose that
leaves my opinion, you know, somewhat in question of credibility. I don't know how it is to live in Alaska or where
Alaska wants to go with its development, but I just came here
because I'm a United States citizen and I'd like to put some
input into what I perceive as a big mistake.

Homer is a -- I enjoy living in Homer. It's a place of incomparable and stunning beauty. I enjoy just driving to work every morning. I'm stunned daily by the incredible beauty of this place. On a one-hour lunch break I can go take my brown bag lunch five miles from where I work and eat lunch with a hundred bald eagles. There's not very many people in the United States that can say that.

I've been driving around Homer looking for some real

estate 'cause I'd like to buy some real estate and build a home here and live here for the rest of my life. I've found that the place I'd like to live is a place that has the nicest view, and that's Diamond Ridge Drive or Skyline. Up on Skyline Drive, lots cost around thirty, thirty-five, forty thousand dollars. That's a lot. I own property in New Mexico and Washington. I've never paid that much money for a lot. Because what these people are selling is not land; they're selling a view, a stunning view of pristine wilderness.

Well, if Lease Sale 149 goes through, me, as a buyer, when I go to hack out the negotiation to buy this property, I'm going to remind this seller that since Lease Sale 149 has gone through, that an oil spill in Homer is imminent, and that the oil companies are coming here. And therefore, I'm not going to pay him top dollar for his real estate because when the oil companies come here, they're going to bring storage tanks, storage sheds, increased truck traffic, pipes, and a large population of transient high-paid oil field workers that are going to come in here during the boom, whoop it up, make a lot of money, have a great time sport fishing, and you can be sure that they're not going to give a damn about the steelhead runs in the Anchor River 20 years from now. And when they leave, they're going to leave and leave Homer in a worse shape than when they found it.

Well, what I would say to the seller of this property

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is that's -- I'm not going to pay top dollar for your land because of the negative impact of what's impending here, and that's a big oil spill and a lot of dead animals. Well, you might conceivably arque that oil development in a small town is good for the real estate market, like, for example, Warm Sutter (ph) at Wyoming. When the oil boom came there, yeah, it was good for the real estate market for a while. Rents went through the roof; prices of houses went through the roof. tripled in value.

The point here, though, is that Warm Sutter (ph), Wyoming, and no other small town in the United States is comparable to Homer. Homer is the incomparable. They don't have view property there, or any place else, like they have it here.

So I think that the development of oil in the southern part of the Cook Inlet would be a real detriment to the people of Homer. My point being that I would much rather see the defeat of this lease sale than to see it go through. would rather pay two dollars more a gallon for gas, and sell my eight-cylinder truck and drive a four-cylinder truck, and pay top dollar for any real estate I buy around here if I could be assured that when I watch the sun set, it sets on the pristine wilderness with clean water, and not through the silhouette of some ugly, disgusting manmade offshore oil platform.

> MR. BROCK: Thank you.

> > (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Megan Corazza, followed by Lawrence Carlton.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MEGAN CORAZZA

My name is Megan Corazza; that's C-o-r-a-z-z-a. My address is Box 1320, and I'm representing myself.

I'm a sophomore at Homer High, and when I was told about Lease Sale 149, I was furious. The oil companies in the upper Inlet have treated the area and its residents with little respect. Their repeated violations of the federal Clean Water Act demonstrate blatant disregard for the well-being of the environment and the animal life. Not only have their illegal actions endangered the environment but also local residents.

In the Poppy Lane case, an oil company in the upper Inlet dumped polluted waste into a gravel pit without having a permit to do so, and the waste leached into the ground, polluting the water of one family's home. And the occupants of that home have developed serious irreversible health problems directly from the toxic compounds.

If the oil companies act so irresponsibly with the area that they already occupy, why should they be allowed to spread destruction further down the Peninsula? They have not showed themselves worthy of being entrusted with developing lower Cook Inlet safely and wisely.

I was directly involved with the cleanup of the Exxon Valdez spill, and I work on a commercial fishing boat in Prince

1.5

William Sound. So I have had first-hand experiences with the destruction caused by oil spills. I do recognize the economic benefits and everyday applications of oil for Alaskans, but I do not believe that the amount of oil that could be found in lower Cook Inlet would significantly increase the total amount of oil being drilled in Alaska enough to justify endangering yet another 2 million acres of Alaskan wilderness.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Lauren Carlton, followed by Glen Caldwell.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. LAUREN CARLTON

That's L-a-u-r-e-n Carlton. I live at -- my mailing address is P.O. Box 198, Homer, Alaska.

I've come up here because this is important to me, like it is everybody else here, and I appreciate you coming down here to hear us out again and to hear what, really, this place means to us and how important it is to preserve it the way it is and to preserve it for our future generations to come.

I come here also as someone who lived on Kalgin
Island, on the north end, last summer, setnet fishing, and I'll
be there again this summer. And I got to tell you, I do not
like the oil rigs in northern Cook Inlet. They're loud; their
crap from their oil rigs comes on my beach, in my nets. I also

fish over on the west side between Big River and Drift River, and we used to have walruses come all the way up here to Kalgin Island, 7 to 10 of them. This year we saw one.

I don't want to necessarily blame it on the oil rigs, but, to me, there might be a correlation. To me, there's a correlation from the pollution coming off the oil rigs and the decline of our resources on Kalgin Island. We can't even clam dig any more on the Island. They're just not there. And I fish with neighbors who have been there 25, 30 years, and they'll tell you sadly how things have declined. And they believe in their hearts that these oil rigs in the upper Cook Inlet have something to do with it because the oil rigs, there weren't near the problems in the environment and the ecosystem and the marine life surrounding upper Cook Inlet that there are now.

Also, I want to say we should look at this from the way Native -- my Native American ancestors look at the land. It is sacred. Why can't we learn from them? Why can't we learn that if we're willing to preserve a church and let it sit for 200, 300 years, why can't we let a wilderness stay there, pristine as it's always been? Why can't we leave it for the generations to come, to appreciate it for the way it is, untouched by development, untouched by pollution? Let's leave it so that our children and future generations can have something that is sacred and gives them something back in peace of

mind and teaches them to love the land and to respect it. We've got to think about that.

There are several Native villages that would be affected by these oil rigs coming into lower Cook Inlet. I don't think they would appreciate it. I can tell you one thing: They were greatly affected by the oil spill of the Glacier Bay in 1987. They were greatly affected by the oil spill of 1989. When are we going to learn that it affects us, not only physically but mentally, socially, spiritually.

I directly worked on the oil spill from day ten on.

I have worked also on tug boats as a U.S. merchant marine ablebodied seaman in Prince William Sound escorting the tankers. I
have worked on the spill response drills, and what -- and I
have also worked on the Valdez Star, which is the only spill
response vessel in Alaska that can handle any oil spills that
would be over 5,000 gallons. And to tell you the truth, it's
not a perfected science at all -- it's scooping up oil.

We practice on the Valdez Star with oranges, with styrofoam, and one time, they did practice with real that they found floating around. And they weren't able to get it all because the seas were four feet high. That's nothing compared to what we get out here. In the Shelikof, in lower Cook Inlet, upper Cook Inlet, let me tell you, the currents that run through here are hell. They are something. When you're out there in a little skiff with your setnet, and you're trying to

pick it up against a current that's going about 10 knots, can you imagine trying to wrangle in an oil spill from a rig? I can't. I just can't see us being able to do it technologically.

So I don't feel it's worth trying to even fool ourselves that we can wrestle in an oil spill. I do not think that we want to be that experiment, or we want to be when everything is on paper (sic). But when it comes to the reality, we really can't handle our oil spills. I know first-hand, in Prince William Sound, in our drills.

We got people from Louisiana and Texas being employed by the spill emergency response companies that get the contracts from Alyeska to be prepared for an oil spill. And those guys, when they first came up, they could not find their way from Hinchinbrook Entrance back to Valdez Narrows without their Lorans. I mean, they just didn't know their way around. They sustained \$50,000 damage to one of their 110-foot vessels in a storm because they didn't know how to lash down their equipment properly.

So I don't want to trust the possibility of us having an oil spill from these oil rigs in the hands of these people that supposedly are ready to take care of our seas in the event of an oil spill. And also, one thing I might add, you know, throw away oil spills, throw away the scientific data. It's just common sense that what we have out here is pretty darned

nice. And when we had an oil rig from Singapore waiting to get their permits to go up the upper Inlet last year, last spring, I saw that oil rig in our beautiful bay, and I thought, 'Hell, no. I don't want to see another -- I do not want to see a rig out here, ever.'

And I think common sense tells us that what we have is so wonderful, so beautiful, and it supports so many things, so many different livelihoods exist in this beautiful bay and beautiful Inlet, let's not compromise it. Let's hold the sacredness to our hearts, and let's leave it alone. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Glen Campbell?

(No audible response)

MR. BROCK: Caldwell. I'm sorry. Glen Caldwell.

(No audible response)

MR. BROCK: Okay. Let's take a quick 10-minute break, and we got 15 more to go, and we'll finish those, and then whoever else that did not sign up. So 10 minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. BROCK: We're back on the record. The first one on this page is Linda Bedman (sic), followed by Mike O'Meara.

And we're having a little problem getting the spelling on everybody's names, so I would ask you to spell your name, and a

little slower than we have been. We're getting a little problem there in making sure we have the correct name.

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. LINDA REDMAN

So it's Linda Redman, R-e-d-m-a-n. And I -- my post office box is 2731 here in Homer.

I am also opposed to the Oil Lease Sale 149. The Oil Lease Sale 149 Environmental Impact Statement admits that lower Cook Inlet is, quote, "one of the most active volcanic regions in the world," unquote.

Last month in Homer, there were several strong tremors. To place it here, for this reason, is an unacceptable risk. As long as this is a draft document, I would urge you to help us with research as far as the environmental situation in this area so that we have clear and details regarding actual seismic activity, in the past and projected details for the future, or projected seismic details.

I would like to see the Environmental Impact Statement reflect the level -- I would like to see it reflect that
the level of risk to the vast majority of Homer residents is
unacceptable, that the vast majority of people here will not
tolerate toxins and drilling rigs in the lower Cook Inlet. We
want to clean up our sea, and that means zero tolerance for
things that would hurt it.

I would like to see the Statement recorded -- I would like to see recorded in this document an accurate indication of

the overall environmental impact that has already occurred in the lower Cook Inlet region over the past 30 years. It is important to know this because I think it would show how fragile the water here is. The Environmental Impact Statement needs to reflect the overall impact of pollution as well as the actual situation of all the sea life and coastal wildlife.

Many members of our community depend on a subsistence lifestyle. This includes several Russian communities as well as the Native villages in the surrounding -- surrounding the area. These areas -- these cultures depend on a subsistence way of life. This oil lease sale is unacceptable for the needs of the people of the Kachemak Bay region. It is also a threat to the fish and the wilderness that hundreds of thousands of people around the world depend on seeing as a continuous resource.

What are we really talking about here? Our health? The sea's health? Or are we talking about a culture with an addiction to a destructive form of energy to fuel its civilization? After looking at the Minerals Management document, I am not convinced this oil lease sale will add to the health of ourselves, our bay, our fish, our tourist industry, our addiction to destructive energy.

I understand that the MMS has a mission to locate domestic sources of energy for our nation. I urge you to look at what we are wasting and help work on the preservation and

efficiency of the resources that we already have available. Up at Prudhoe Bay, there's been continuous flares flaring natural gas for 20 years. And I've been told, like the amount that they burn on a daily basis would like heat Alaska, heat all the homes in Alaska. Things like that are not acceptable, especially if we are concerned about energy in this country.

I would like to see automobiles that burn -- you know, that are very efficient, and we have that capability.

And I would like to see the Minerals Service look into that and see documents that, even in this particular document, show what potential there is for energy efficiency and what reserves we have there in this country.

options, and this presented in a realistic way, realistic format in the document. That's -- I'd like to see especially detailed information on specific alternatives regarding tidal energy and wind. I would like to see fair comparisons of costs regarding benefits and risks. I think it is possible to also make this document really concise with very good information in it that could be footnoted.

I want my community and our country to make it easy and cheap to use energy that does not harm our air and water. Development of clean, healthy energy would ensure our national security. Thanks.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

1

## (Applause)

2

#### MR. BROCK: Mike O'Meara, followed by Linda Feiler.

3

4

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MIKE O'MEARA

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

21

20

22 23

24

25

Gosh, you got all this junk up here. I don't have room for mine. More memorabilia for you. This was gathered on the spot out on the road the other day when some people got together for a little impromptu, I guess, demonstration is what you call it. Anyway, those people who passed by or sat in signed this thing, and I guess I'll send it back with you along

> MR. BROCK: Okay.

with your other toys and things.

(Applause)

Can I fold it? MR. BROCK:

MR. O'MEARA: Oh, I'll leave that up to you guys.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

BY MR. O'MEARA (Resuming):

My name's Mike O'Meara. That's O'-M-e-a-r-a. My mailing address is Box 1125, Homer, Alaska.

I left L.A. about 27 years ago, and first time I went around Baycrest Hill, like so many other people that have talked to you tonight, I knew I was home. Had to go back for a year, but I made a beeline back to Alaska, and as soon as I could find a place to live down here, I moved down here, too. Took eight years though, eight years in Anchorage.

> I quess you know my position 'cause you know me. Ι

don't think that this lease sale is a good idea, and I don't think it's in the best interests of the state or the nation. I support Alternative 2, and I'd like to suggest that you guys take a real good hard look at this document you've produced and think about what you wrote in there because I think just reading what you wrote tells us that it's impossible to develop this area in an environmentally responsible manner, which means you ought to change the suggested alternative. You guys ought to be suggesting Alternative 2 to Bruce Babbitt.

What'd you think of our turnout tonight?

MR. BROCK: Good.

(Applause)

## BY MR. O'MEARA (Resuming):

You know, this is a little different place than Anchorage or Valdez or Kenai. And I think the difference is, this is a community. And I don't know if that really means anything to you guys; I hope it does. You all seem like nice fellows. I've seen Ray before. I've seen Bob a lot of times and talked to him. I don't know you, Barry, but I think you're like the rest of us. You know, you have lives that you lead and things that you value and love. And I'd just like you to, for a minute as you sit here, put yourselves in our place.

A lot of us have talked about the experience of the Exxon Valdez. That's because none of us are ever, ever, as long as we live, going to forget it. We can't. None of us

ever want to see it again.

This document says that if you hold this lease sale, we're going to have other oil spills here. Maybe they'll be a lot smaller, but maybe they won't. As people have said over and over again tonight, the cost is too high, the risk is too great, the loss is unimaginable.

I'm not going to go into great detail tonight.

Everybody's tired, and that's more appropriate for written

comments, and I'll give those to you before the deadline. I've

spent a lot of time with the document already; I'm going to

have to spend a lot more.

I would say this, though: Keep in mind that if you sell this lease sale and there's an oil spill in Cook Inlet of any substantial size, if you think this turnout tonight was impressive, wait and see what happens then.

So what's the issue here? I guess basically it's been said a lot, but I'll say it again: Are we willing to displace the existing values of this area, the environmental quality, the unique beauty, community, all of the things that that entails, in order for profits for multi-national corporations and a little bit of revenue for the federal government? That's really what we're talking about here.

And it's a real issue; I realize that because the OCS Program, as I understand it, has been the second largest generator of revenue for this country right under the IRS. So I

know you're under pressure to sell leases. But it doesn't have a damned thing to do with energy independence, as people have mentioned tonight, because, first of all, at the max, going by your figures anyway, there's two months' supply of oil in there in terms of the amount of consumption that this country goes through everyday. Two months. Is it worth two months to run the doomsday machine out there, like L.A., and destroy what we've got here out in the Inlet? I don't think so.

Another factor was mentioned tonight, too. A good part of that oil will probably be exported. So I think there's a good deal of hypocrisy at work, not with you, fellows, but with the policy-makers.

I won't go into a lot of detail here about what's at stake. People have mentioned the view. If you're not interested in the aesthetics, think of it this way: To us, the view is dollars and jobs. There's the fishery, 6,672 seasonal jobs, at last count. It's hard to sell fish if your customers outside think of the place as being a place of tainted waters. That's an impact that I don't think was even addressed in here, the perceptions of the people outside with regard to the product.

People have mentioned, again, the 13 parks, refuges, sanctuaries, and other special public lands that have been set aside around here. People come from all over the world to see those. Again, that translates into jobs for us. And as a

reminder, tourism is the fastest growing segment of the Alaska economy. It's certainly very important here. And all the wildlife.

What the Draft Environmental Impact Statement tells us is that if development occurs, there's going to be chronic pollution, and there are going to be accidental spills. It tells us there's going to be local disruption of the economy from time to time. It tells us that visual qualities in these federal lands are going to be disrupted. It tells us that subsistence harvests are going to take a real hard hit from time to time. And with subsistence harvests, as you point out in the document, you're talking also about the culture of the people who practice that subsistence way of life.

Expenses, property taxes are going to go up if there's development. I can talk to that from experience. When I first bought my property here, the great pipeline boom was just getting under way. Within a period of seven years, my taxes went up 740 percent. And there wasn't any oil around here; it was indirect. It was all the speculation and the land trading, all that loose money floating around. But I wasn't making any of it. I still had to pay the taxes; I still have to pay them today. So it didn't help me very much, and it won't help me if you do it to me again.

So what's wrong with the Statement? As I said, I'm not going to go into great detail, but I'll mention a few

things that occurred to me, and other people mentioned it, too.

When you look at the document, even though you've done a much better job this time than you did the last time in terms of at least mentioning the differences between upper and lower Cook Inlet, especially in terms of the social structure and the economy, you still haven't got it right. And it's still easy to see that this document is actually based on science with an agenda. And, gentlemen, one of the things that was wrong with the science that was done after the Exxon Valdez oil spill was it was science with an agenda, too, on both sides.

The oil companies wanted to prove that it wasn't such a big deal. The federal and state governments wanted to show as much damage as they could. As a result, what we have now are a lot of damned inconclusive studies that don't help us a whole lot. Science with an agenda is useless.

The National Research Council conducted a formal review of MMS in its ESP Program and found it wanting in 1989, 1992, and 1993. I think you guys are trying to overcome that; I think you're working on that here. But you haven't done it. It was mentioned tonight that there are an awful lot of inhouse studies here that are quoted, and I doubt seriously that many of those at least have had peer review, or at least proper peer review.

In reading over the document, I see in there what

appear to me assumptions that are very speculative in many cases. This is especially too -- especially true with relationship to risk projections. I see conclusions that often fail to reflect the data, at least the data that's presented. I see assessment of significance of impacts that appears to be biased and judgmental.

For example, I'll quote one thing in there that struck me in particular. And that had to do with the effect on some of those public lands, those parks and refuges and other types of special areas in the event that oil was spilled on them. And the description was that there'd be a very slightly reduced visual quality following such a spill. And it reminded me of all those photos of what happened after the Exxon Valdez spill. And it reminded me of some of the shorelines I visited after that. I wouldn't call that "slight."

MR. BROCK: Mike, can you summarize?

MR. O'MEARA: Yeah, I will.

BY MR. O'MEARA (Resuming):

And there are important impacts omitted, too. For example, in discussing that issue, nowhere in there did I find reference to what the visual impacts of the rigs would be. And people have mentioned that several times tonight. Nor did I find any indication of what those rigs working out there and discharging produced waters, cuttings, and what have you, what that -- what influence that would have on those people in the

villages who were involved in subsistence, aside from a spill.

A spill isn't the only thing that will have impacts.

And I'm going to really wrap it up now, but there's — the one glaring omission that I'd like to mention tonight is nowhere in this document is there any mention of the planning phase impacts. This lease sale has already had impacts here. The fact that I have had to spend the last two weeks trying to deal with this issue, and will spend much more time, is one of those impacts. I could have been working; I could have been visiting my mother in Los Angeles; I could have been on vacation. That's an impact.

I'm very judicious in my use of an automobile. I try to restrict my trips to town and conduct all of my business when I'm here so I don't have to keep driving around and burning more fuel. I've burned a lot of fuel because of this oil and gas lease sale, coming and going, connecting with people, trying to make sure that everybody knows what's going on and that we have something to say.

### (Applause)

I'm going to recommend you guys all read a book here because it deals with that issue and a lot of others. You may be familiar with it already. It's called <u>Oil in Troubled</u>

Waters by William R. Frutenberg (ph) and Robert Gamling (ph).

And it's published in '94, State University of New York Press.

And it deals with this thing that's going on here tonight, with

why the OCS Program has been rejected everywhere in the United States except off the coast of Louisiana and Texas. And it talks about how maybe the Minerals Management Service can do a little bit better job of dealing with people's concerns. And it isn't a condemnation of you guys either. I mean, it's a look at the issue, and it tries to be constructive.

So there's a lot of other stuff to talk about, but I'm going to lay the paper on you later.

MR. BROCK: Thank you for your comments.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Linda, followed by Josh Brooks.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. LINDA FEILER

My name is Linda Feiler, F-e-i-l-e-r, and I'm at Box 148, Anchor Point, Alaska 99556.

It's always hard to follow Mike O'Meara and everybody else who spoke so eloquently, so I'm not going to repeat every single detail that we hope we've drilled you with.

But I'm here representing my family that came up to visit and fell in love with the area and every tourist that came to my gift shop over the past 18 years, with pens raised, ready to sign whatever petition I had out trying to protect the water, the wolves, the river, or whatever else was being polluted or destroyed. I'm sure if I contacted all of them, they would all write you the same letter, asking you to omit this sale so that they can come back up.

In the 18 years I've been here, we've had horrible problems with oil. We drank oil in Anchor Point; we had benzene in our water at 200 parts per million. And until we caused a royal stink, we didn't get it omitted. We still have problems in Anchor Point. There are about 1,400 toxic dump

sites on the Kenai Peninsula.

Besides the fact that deforestation is going on everywhere, none of us want to see our lands destroyed by -- I mean, our homes destroyed on the water side. We face Cook Inlet up in Anchor Point, and a lot of us fish there, and a lot of us eat off the coast.

In your document, you refer to a pipeline that's going to be three miles outside the coast of Anchor Point. I don't think anybody in Anchor Point is going to be able to handle more benzene. I personally would have liked to have seen some document that shows how many deaths there's been in the area and whether any of the deaths were related to consumption of benzene. Maybe benzene was only a partial reason why these people died, but a lot of my friends have died of cancer in Anchor Point. And a lot of people in Homer are dead, and there are a lot of birth defects that go on. And they're not publicized 'cause they're very touchy, touchy situations, and no one wants their names and their babies taken photographs of.

You said that you would send me a document showing us the environmental impact on humans. There was some other piece

of information that you were going to have that was going to talk about the effects of this new oil discovery on humans.

And I asked you whether it was how much money we were going to make or how many of us were going to be revisiting the Homer Mental Health Clinic. You don't know the document you referred to?

MR. BROCK: I'm not familiar with any document like that, but I.....

MS. FEILER: There was another man with you, and he said they were doing research on it. And it was socioeconomic, supposedly, and it had nothing to do with our health.

BY MS. FEILER (Resuming):

There was another document also that was — the federal government was supposed to come down with more maps because you hadn't finished doing the research that you needed. One was supposed to show the toxic hot spots in Kachemak Bay, where the water circulates, comes back, and hangs out in one particular area. And there were two hot spots, but supposedly, the federal government hadn't gotten all their work finished and didn't have the documents to give us at that time. I'd like to see those documents.

Well, I'll close here. I just wish there was some statement that I could make that would finally hit home and cause you to go back and tell your representative that we don't want it. These people agree with me; they're all individual

letters written to Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt. I mailed those; I made copies of each letter to give to Judith Gottlieb, and I hope you'll deliver them with my sentiments to please not allow any more leasing in this area.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

(Pause - Whispered consultation)

MR. BROCK: Josh Brooks, followed by Dean Sundmark.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. JOSH BROOKS

Not too many people on your side tonight. I'm not either. So hello, my name is Josh Brooks, 3592, Homer, Alaska.

I'm a 19-year-old registered voter and taxpayer of Homer. I have been a resident of Homer for the past 12 years. Tonight I speak for my generation of sport and commercial fishermen. I plan to live and work here for the rest of my life. Those of you who are my parents' age have already had a good life here. However, if you allow oil rigs in Cook Inlet, then you are possibly denying me and others of my generation the same opportunity to have a good life here.

I was 14 years old when the oil spill happened, and I remember how upset my parents were. My dad helped build a log boom -- the log booms to try to contain the oil. I was in junior high school at the time and helped with the otters they were cleaning there. I was so sad and disgusted by what I saw, I never want to see anything like this again.

Those of you who are promoting the oil rigs can't 1 quarantee me that there will not be another accident or that 2 the noise from the rigs won't affect the returns of Kachemak 3 Bay and Cook Inlet fish. I don't understand why you would 4 gamble with my opportunity to make a living here and raise my 5 family here. 6 If fishing is hurt by oil rigs, then I will have to 7 move somewhere else. As a member of the next generation of 8 Homer citizens, I ask you to reconsider your requests. Thank 9 10 you. MR. BROCK: Thank you. 11 12 (Applause) 13 MR. BROCK: Dean Sundmark, followed by Scott Cunningham. 14 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DEAN SUNDMARK 15 My name is Dean Sundmark. I live up on.... 16 Would you spell that? 17 MR. BROCK: 18 MR. SUNDMARK: S-u-n-d-m-a-r-k. 19 BY MR. SUNDMARK (Resuming): I live up on Race Road, and my mail comes to Box 375. 20 I got here when the meeting started tonight, and all 21 the ideas that I wanted to talk about have been mentioned many 22 times over, so I won't go into all of them in detail. However, 23 well, I'd just like to give you a little excerpt of some of the 24 25 things in my life in the last couple of weeks.

I got a telephone call from a woman I don't know in Virginia. She asked me about Kachemak Bay; she asked me where to go sea kayaking; she asked me about otters. And I told her about going behind Yukon and Hesketh Island and the beautiful scenes back there and what she could see. Recently, I've talked to tourists about the eagles down on the Spit. I have talked to tourists about how the "L.A. Times" has written up Halibut Cove as one of their top tourist destinations in the nation for this coming year. I've told them about other natural history tours, Seldovia, hiking trails, and, of course, my own bed and breakfast here in town.

Last summer I told a man from New York City about the life cycle of salmon. I told them about glaciers and how they shape this area. I've tol- -- I've answered countless questions about the Exxon Valdez oil spill, of which I wish I knew more. I've answered a lot of questions about whales in this area to people from all over this country and all over the world.

I think with this oil sale we're spending a dollar to retrieve a dime. And what we stand to lose is not just my business, not just the businesses of other people that work in tourism here, but that woman from Virginia, the guys from Texas that I told where to catch dollies on the Anchor River, they value this area for how clean and pristine it is. I value it; that's why I moved here. But it's not just us; it's people all

over, citizens just like us.

And I think, collectively, nobody really wants this sale. I think the masses don't want it. And so I urge you to can it. Can the sale. Do whatever you can to recommend that it's closed down.

Finally, I really appreciate that you're here to take our comments tonight and to listen to us, and that you're -you've had several meetings like this, you're going to Kodiak.

And I'd like to suggest that, because in the wintertime it's difficult to travel across Kachemak Bay, and it's expensive to fly, that maybe you have meetings in Seldovia and Port Graham,

Nanwalek and listen to the folks over there because I think they'll say the similar -- a similar thing to what you're hearing here tonight. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Scott Cunningham.

(Inaudible audience response)

MR. BROCK: He left? S-c-h-a-a-d? Howard? It's not right.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. KONRAD SCHAAD

My name is Konrad Schaad, 53198 McNeil Point, Homer.

I speak for myself, my wife, and my two sons.

And when I speak with my sons about the future, they mention they dream about becoming fishermen or outdoorsmen, and

1 they never quite mention plans yet of becoming oil spill 2 cleanup workers or anything like that. 3 When I read or listen to any of these studies, we 4 The last expert I trusted was Joe Hazelwood. rely on experts. 5 (Laughter) 6 So I think that says it all. I'm against it, and I 7 hope you listen to all these folks here so we don't have to do 8 the same with the Kachemak buy-back or Bristol Bay. Listen 9 first and act accordingly. Thank you. 10 MR. BROCK: Thank you. 11 (Applause) 12 MR. BROCK: Todd Radmaker, followed by Ben Levine. 13 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. TODD RADMAKER 14 My name is Todd Radmaker on a boat. 15 MR. BROCK: Would you spell that? 16 MR. RADMAKER: R-a-d-m-a-k-e-r. 17 BY MR. RADMAKER (Resuming): 18 And my P.O. Box is 716. I'd like to thank you gen-19 tlemen for giving us this opportunity to exercise democracy 20 here tonight. 21 I grew up believing -- or I grew up and I learned 2.2 that democracy was a -- our government is for the people and by 23 the people, and that if you are employees of the government, 24 you are serv- -- you serve us. 25 MR. BROCK: That's right.

BY MR. RADMAKER (Resuming):

And we, the people of Homer, have spoke resoundingly and unanimously, and we have said no. And I believe this is a question of quality of life. And I don't think people like Exxon have the right to profit on the destruction of our quality of life. And our quality of life is not for sale.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Ben Levine.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Ben had to go home.

MR. BROCK: He had to leave? Okay. Patrick (sic) King, followed by Sharon W-k-y-t-a-l, I believe it is.

MS. KING: It's really Patricia. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: I'm sorry.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. PATRICIA KING

My name is Patricia King. My address is Post Office Box 15012, Fritz Creek 99603. Fritz Creek is a little further out in the woods than the rest of downtown Homer.

Sometimes I think that folks like you and some of the rest of us come from such different places that I feel that I need to start by trying to explain where I come from. My parents came to this country as homesteaders -- and I mean this country here, these woods -- 47 years ago. And I was raised out there in the deep woods in what was then a pristine woods

in a pretty much pristine area.

So to me, the changes that have taken place over the 47 years since my parents came here have been somewhat astonishing, coming to modern life from the point of view of a wild woods child, which is somewhat different from the experience one would have if they were raised in a city and took things like pavement and high-rises and oil derricks and all of that for granted.

During the years since my family has been here, I've seen a lot of physical changes here with my own eyes, predominantly in the fact that many of the animals, fish, crab, shrimp, those sorts of things just aren't here like they used to be. And it's really sad. We used to go down on the dock here at the end of the Homer Spit, and people would just put a fishing line in the water and would pull up king crabs. They were everywhere all over the dock, and you had to worry about whether one was going to reach out and pinch you if you were a little kid. Well, they aren't there any more.

And your studies tell us that the oil industry doesn't have anything to do with that. I rather suspect that the oil industry does have something to do with that, although that that's probably not the only reason for the decline of species around here. There are many different factors that interweave in our universe. I think your studies have been somewhat minimal, and I don't think you know.

Having read the whole DEIS through quite thoroughly twice, my immediate reaction was that the book you wrote is its own reason why this sale should not happen. I think sometimes these plans are created for us by people from that other world where our world is an abstraction. But to us, these things are really very real, the health of our fishes and our crabs and our animals and ourselves.

After the Exxon Valdez oil spill, I found myself down in Valdez with a group of other concerned people, physically with my hands on oiled otters trying to wash the oil off of them. And I looked into the eyes of those creatures, and I don't want to have to do that again. And that's the reality, and it's not an abstraction.

And many of the things that are in your book also should not be taken as abstractions. And I don't understand how, whichever version of your spill probability you look at, be it 27 percent, 72, or 87, how you can consider that that could happen and that the effects that you predicted that would happen to the subsistence lifestyle of the communities of Port Graham and Nanwalek, to even consider that those things were possible, to me, would take away any logical reason to allow this to continue, not to mention all of the other byproducts that are put into the Inlet. And whether you want to count them or not, they're there, and they're not healthy. You wouldn't have them for breakfast, and neither would I.

Another interesting thing to me about your DEIS is that you break it down into many different sections, and you've got your base case and your low case and your high case and your cumulative case. And I would submit that the only reasonable way to look at a scenario like that is the entire cumulative case that does take into consideration this potential federal sale with the state oil development, with the logging, with everything else that's going on because it is one world. It's all connected, and you can't separate it and say that only this little thing is going to happen here.

And now I have a question for you. How much influence do the three of you have on this decision? Do you actually have input into this decision yourselves?

MR. BROCK: Well, I can answer that our job is to make sure that the decision-makers have all the information that we've gathered. Yes, we have a recommendation, but we put together the document, and we put together the information you give us, and we try to make the most honest represented information document that we can possibly put together.

MS. KING: Do you actually make a recommendation, then, or do you just transmit what we said?

MR. BROCK: We usually make a recommendation, too.

MS. KING: Okay.

BY MS. KING (Resuming):

I, for one, would appreciate if you would recommend,

2 go with Alternative 2. Thank you. 3 (Applause) 4 MR. BROCK: Sharon W-h-y-t-z-l, or t-e-l. Or it 5 could be W-r-y-t, at Post Office Box 1529, Homer. 6 (Inaudible audience response, laughter) 7 Really. I feel comfortable that's MR. BROCK: 8 correct. Susan A-r-n-d-t, I believe it is. 9 (No audible response) 10 MR. BROCK: Wiley (sic) Dunne, D-u-n-n-e. PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. WILLY DUNNE 11 12 Hi. My name's Willy Dunne, D-u-n-n-e. MR. BROCK: 13 Sorry. 14 BY MR. DUNNE (Resuming): 15 My mailing address is Post Office Box 15043, Fritz 16 And I'm here representing myself and my family. Before 17 my daughter left here, she wanted me to make sure that you knew that she wants to have her children and her grandchildren to be 18 able to fish and watch whales out in Cook Inlet. 19 20 only five years old, and she cares about that. 21 Thanks for coming here and listening to us. I know 22 it's been a long night, but I hope you'll listen to what you've 23 heard and incorporate it in your documents. And what you've heard tonight is that Oil Lease Sale 24 25 149 is just unacceptable. It's unacceptable to risk commercial

based on what's on your own DEIS, that the sale not be held and

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

fishing, to risk subsistence lifestyles, to risk jobs and business income from tourism, charter sport fishing, other local industries. It's unacceptable to risk harm to marine and terrestrial wildlife, to risk a unique and sustainable community that we have here. It's just unacceptable to risk our way of life and our home.

But what you've also heard here tonight, and the real reason, as far as I understand being here, is to comment on the Draft EIS, and you've heard over and over again there's problems with it. I'm sorry to say, gentlemen, the Draft EIS sucks.

## (Laughter)

It's not adequate; it's a faulty document. It's inconsistent, contradicting; it's lacking common sense or scientific validity. It's supposedly written by experts, but the people you've heard here tonight, these folks live here, they work here, they make their living in Cook Inlet. They're not special interests. They love and care for their home; they know about it because they love it. And they have reviewed this document and said that it's just not acceptable.

I would ask you to go to Director Gottlieb and Secretary Babbitt and tell them that you need to do it over again.

It's just not acceptable as it is. The -- when you come back with a final EIS -- and actually, I would hope that you'd come back with a better draft first -- but when you finally do come

back with a final Environmental Impact Statement, if it is an adequate document, with all the concerns addressed, the only logical alternative will be to cancel Lease Sale 149.

The people that you see here tonight, just a fraction of the people who care about Cook Inlet. Even five hours ago, when the place was packed to the rafters, just a fraction of the people who live and work here and care about the place.

And I guarantee you that if Lease Sale 149 goes ahead, there'll be many times more people demanding that those leases be bought back. You'll have to get a bigger room next time -- I don't know where you're going to find one.

What you've heard here tonight from people over and over again, that the smart thing to do is cancel Lease Sale 149. Otherwise, the people of the United States will have to pay a stupidity tax years down the road to buy those leases back, and lawsuits will cost everybody money. So we just ask that you choose Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative and cancel the lease sale.

So thanks for providing a chance to comment tonight, but please don't waste our time coming back with any more poorly written documents with bad ideas like Lease Sale 149. Please let us get back to our lives; there's other things I'd rather be doing here than reviewing this and commenting here. Please let us get back to our lives and our work, and we can take care of ourselves. Thanks.

1	MR. BROCK: Thank you.
2	(Applause)
3	MR. BROCK: Alla I-r-e-d-a-l-e.
4	(No audible response)
5	MR. BROCK: Not here? Eric Belcher?
6	MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: He's opposed, but he
7	must have gone.
8	MR. BROCK: Dan Levinson, L-e-v-i-n-s-o-n?
9	PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DAN LEVINSON
10	Before I start, I'd like to say I am really impressed
11	by the turnout tonight and the tenacity of the people in their
12	sincerity. I'm not going to be a zealot when some of them have
13	been, and I'm not going to be able to come up with a lot of
14	data that some people have offered. But I'd to
15	MR. BROCK: Did I spell your name correct, sir? L-e-
16	v-i-n-s-o-n?
17	MR. LEVINSON: Yes, you did.
18	MR. BROCK: Okay. And is the your address 184
19	West Bayview Avenue, Homer?
20	MR. LEVINSON: Yes.
21	MR. BROCK: Okay. Go ahead, sir.
22	MR. LEVINSON: Thank you.
23	(Pause)
24	BY MR. LEVINSON (Resuming):
25	For the record, my name is Dan Levinson. I live at

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084 184 West Bayview Avenue. I'm a retired biology teacher that specialized in field observations. My wife and I have lived in Homer since 1990, so we're relative newcomers here. But we were camping at Green Timbers back in '62 when there were timbers to camp under. We came up again in 1970, and again in the summer of '89 during the oil spill. So we've seen the changes.

I don't profess any great expertise regarding the biology of Cook Inlet or the Kenai Peninsula, but I do have a different perspective on this, and I'd like you and the audience to bear with me.

I spent more than 20 years doing field work up in Nome, Alaska, on the Seward Peninsula. And this includes studies of red salmon and the rehabilitation, 10 years worth of sea ice and marine temp recordings, and a natural history of the Kigluaik Mountain Range. More to the point of this meeting, I have never forgotten the philosophy and role of Minerals Management Service at the time of the Norton Sound lease sale back in 1988. It is that history and your decision to allow offshore mining, I have been told, are still relevant to what is happening here tonight. So I've agreed to offer some brief but pointed testimony at the encouragement of Mr. Zatz.

Mr. Raymond Emerson, you and Mr. George Feloulis (ph) were listed contacts for the Norton Sound EIS in 1988, and I

see that you're also listed for this draft on Cook Inlet. I think you'd agree that Nome, Alaska, is no hotbed of Greenpeace environmentalism. But we all knew the value of our salmon, king crab, tomcods, and marine mammals, especially the seal and walrus used by Native people. So imagine my surprise, skimming in the middle of the Norton Sound EIS and reading something about moose being affected by offshore dredging.

I want to quote a part of a paragraph on page 4-B-95. Quote:

"Major effects on Nome subsistence harvests are expected as a result of the proposed lease sale. Major effects would occur as a result of increased levels of mercury in the water column that would bioaccumulate through the food chain. If harvests of marine resources, particularly seals and possibly walrus and crabs, become unavailable -- a major effect -- it is probable that hunters would turn to other sources for The most logical resource that their meat. would receive more harvest pressure is moose. It is the only large terrestrial animal -- pardon me -- mammal available, and it is the only resource, other than small mammals and bear, which is not as plentiful or desirable, that is not likely to have elevated blood levels of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

#### mercury."

3 4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

I had to read that several times to figure out what you guys were really saying. What you were really saying was -- and saying it mostly to the Native community -- that you were going to okay offshore dredging for gold even though it was going to put mercury in the water column. And you were saying to the Inupiat and Yupiks, 'Let them eat moose.'

All night long, the spotlight has been on this beautiful Kachemak Bay and people's dependency on it and their love of it. But I want to put the spotlight right on Minerals for a moment and their philosophy. In spite of the question of methyl mercury, Minerals Management went on record as in favor of that lease sale. In a Final EIS, Minerals said, 'All those tests showing potential for methyl mercury contamination were flawed.' But the important issue is that Minerals Management would have continued that sale regardless.

And I would like to add as an aside that I know Dave Escoldson (ph) and Tom Peters pan metallic mercury on the beaches of Nome. My student, Stewart Bachman (ph), was squeezing metallic mercury out of the mud at Belmont Point. You can't tell me there's no mercury out there.

In conclusion, I think Minerals Management needs to make it clear to the community of Homer that they are in business to encourage location and extraction of minerals and are bounded only by the law, not aesthetic values, not cultural

traditions, not economic dependencies, not religious views of a 1 2 living earth. I press this because there's a lot of well 3 meaning people out there wanting badly to find ways of intelli-4 gent compromise. That's quite laudable. But unless Minerals 5 has undergone a major change since 1988, I think those well 6 meaning people are going to have to think about picking a side 7 to fight on. 8 I'm sorry this sounds so adversarial, but we must 9 remember, Exxon didn't have an oil spill problem. 10 us an attitude problem that made things worse. If Minerals

They handed insists on allowing drilling in one of the most active seismic zones in the world, then we will risk one of the most productive marine systems in the world.

The real struggle to protect what we have starts after you folks go back home. I hope we're equal to the task. I hope we don't get our hearts broken. Thank you.

> MR. BROCK: Thank you.

> > (Applause)

(No audible response)

MR. BROCK: Ader Newton? N-e-w-t-o-n?

MR. BROCK: Jessica B-r-a-i-n-a-r-d.

(No audible response)

That's all I have on my list. MR. BROCK: Is there anybody here that would like to make a comment? Okay. one coming from the back there.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CHRIS CHAVASSE

# Good evening, gentlemen. I did submit my name. It is Chris, C-h-r-i-s, Chavasse, C-h-a-v-a-s-s-e. And I'm here representing myself, but I'm wearing a t-shirt that my kids sent me from Fairbanks, and it says "Treasure the Earth's Magic." And these kids picked it out themselves, I understand.

It is my belief that the fundamental magnificence, the peace, and the dignity of lower Cook Inlet will be substantively impaired by proposed Lease Sale 149. Although the Draft EIS for this proposed sale is an important contribution to the understanding of the Inlet's overall dynamics, it falls short in several critical areas.

One, the long-term implications of industrially imposed social disruption are not considered. The equal protection of the rights of those most likely to suffer direct effects of accidents are not considered. The evident weight placed on long-term externally controlled profits, including those to governmental organization, is inappropriate. It lacks social, spiritual, and environmental sensitivity and responsibility.

Four, the water quality assessments are flawed in their design and analytical method.

Four-A, the design is evidently subjective. It inadequately identifies areas subject to sedimentary deposition and, by extension, ignores the necessary examination of poten-

tial and extant biologically active reservoirs of anthropogenic contaminants.

The bioassays are similarly deficient in scope.

Neither the species' locations nor the contaminant selection provide a scientific basis for consideration in defining the anthropogenic contaminant contribution or burdens in the marine living resources of the surrounding and common areas. And by the surrounding and common areas, I wish to imply the oceanographical, geographical, and atmospheric commonalities, both within the immediate vicinity of the proposed sale and those that are scientifically identified as being dynamically connected by natural environmental functions. These are not evidently connected within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Four-C, the dependence of local coastal communities on the commonly occurring aquatic life for subsistence, commerce, and recreation has been effectively ignored in the species bioassay selections. The expense alluded to in your presentation of the report as a limiting factor in establishing contaminant knowledge is an economic veil which impugns the integrity of scientific assessment of the biology of the organisms/species extant in this area.

Without a thorough, broad-spectrum analysis of the micro-organism communities; all-important subsistence, commercial, and recreational species; and endemic and migratory avian

populations, the assessment is incomplete. A species contaminant burden bioassay that is as limited as the one performed for the DEIS is misleading insofar as it denies fundamental toxicological assessment methodologies and ignores the interactive elements that induce deleterious biological effects in organisms small and large. And that includes us, and there are no human bioassays noted in your report. I think that is a fundamental flaw, too.

The ubiquity of a commonplace occurrence of manmade environmental contaminants in every aquatically oriented species of the planet is well noted in archives, journals, and papers, published and unpublished, of the sciences of environmental assessment and toxicology. No total contaminant burdens are noted in this DEIS. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn by the doctor who prepared for this section of the report.

The further assessment of anthropogenic pollution of the species in the area should adhere to the strictest scientifically reliable measurements of persistent and other toxicologically active substances. The outmoded methodology intrinsic to many EPA assessment criteria developed in the 1970s are often still utilized. This must be avoided in the further evaluation of the areas' environmental corruption -- I'll say that again. This must be avoided in the further evaluation of the area's environmental corruption by industrially manufact

tured and population generated products and poisons.

I personally would like to see the contaminant data undergo a complete review by the United States Department of the Interior, Environmental Sciences Laboratory in Pawtucksett (ph), Maryland, to ensure that they are conclusive and that they are accurate.

At this time in human history, the advanced sciences have concluded that the very life support systems that we rely upon are in jeopardy from biospheric pollution, which places all of us in jeopardy. Alaska is an Arctic state and, as such, is highly vulnerable to pollutants generated within her own borders and is, with other.....

13 (Off record)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14 | (Tape Change - Tape No. 5 of 5)

15 (On record)

16 BY MR. CHAVASSE (Continuing):

....in the lower latitudes of the planet. Many, if not most, of these poisons are byproducts of industry, subsidiaries, or associates of the industry that proposed Lease Sale 149 is promoting. This fact should be borne out by a comprehensive, broad-spectrum contaminant bioassay analysis.

Suffice it to say that it is indeed a peculiar madness that, despite incontrovertible evidence implicating fossil fuels and their byproducts in the demise of the genetic integrity of biological life as we know it, the governments -- that is plural -- in whom we put our trust, maintain their right to expand the development of the sources of these biologically active toxins.

The DEIS states that global, or big picture, concerns are beyond the scope of the agency. This is an unfortunate statement and truly indicative of the lack of inter-agency involvement that the public rightfully expects. This is perhaps the first example of rationalized, willful ignorance that can be found in a living document.

What is at stake here, as in ANWR and elsewhere, is our future health, the health of future generations, and the type of biological diversity that has provided for the magnificent natural productivity we know on the planet today. What is at stake here is also the peace that we hold so dear in our experiences of the natural world and the dignity that we are afforded in our knowledge that we are doing what is truly right for now and for the future.

So please consider, for the administrative record, that I oppose present and further production from oil-bearing deposits in the lower Cook Inlet, and I am specifically opposed to Lease Sale 149. If this sale is developed, it will directly and further impugn my peace, dignity, and health. It will also substantively detract from the beauties that maintain my excitement and love for our natural environment.

And I would hope that you don't waste any more money

in going forward with a final Environmental Impact Statement and that you just can this whole thing right now and get real, folks. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Young man?

(Pause - Whispered conversation)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. ERIC BREMICKER

My name is Eric Bremicker, and Bremicker is B-r-e-m-i-c-k-e-r. I'm from the Fritz Creek area, P.O. Box 15126.

In the EIS it seems you've missed over -- or forgotten to include a whole section of damage that bringing this oil out of the ground will do, and that's what the oil will do after it's burned as gasoline. It will be burned in the United States and all over the world, and put tons and tons of pollution into the air. And I didn't see anything in that -- about that in the EIS.

That was just the first thing I wanted to say. Also, I've been living here for all my life, 16 years, and when I was a little kid, I would look into tide pools, and they were very full of life, hundreds of different creatures in them, all kinds of unimaginable life forms. And up until the point of the Exxon oil spill, it was -- it's always been like that. But afterward, even in the places that the oil spill never reached, all the way in the back of Kachemak Bay, you look into the tide pools, and there's hardly anything. There's sea anemones and

Irish lords, and that's pretty much it.

And this -- like some of these people mentioned, this whole Cook Inlet is basically a big tide pool. It's got gyres, and the water pretty much stays in one place. So, I mean, if there's pollutants being dumped into it, it's going to end up like that because a lot of the oil didn't reach back into those tide pools that are now pretty much empty, and they're now pretty much empty. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Who's next?

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CHRIS HERREID

My name is Chris. That's spelled H-e-r-r-e-i-d. My mailing address is P.O. Box 1358, Homer.

I just walked into this kind of cold. I don't -- I haven't read this, but I'm just going to kind of talk about the way I feel.

I came here about five years ago, 1990, and 1991, I went out in Prince William Sound and worked the herring fishery there, and it was my first experience out in water. And it was pretty impressive 'cause in 20 minutes, I saw this guy pack two tenders full of herring. That's about -- he made about \$375,000 in 20 minutes, and I thought that was pretty impressive.

And the next year, '92, there -- some herring came

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084 back, but they had cancer on them. And then '93, no herring; '94, no herring. This year they're not even going to bother opening up Prince William Sound.

Now, I would imagine that a lot of the justification for opening up this drilling would be that it is oil equals revenue, oil equals money. Well, as far as I can tell, in my five years, oil equals death.

And I just bought some land here. I'm in it for the long run, and I don't like the way I see things going. And so I urge you most heartily to just can this whole thing 'cause I don't want to bring my kids up looking out over oil rigs and all that. I mean, this is just common sense.

I mean, you look at -- if you go over to Prince William, and these guys just have to bring in a boat, fill it full of oil, and take it out. The Valdez Narrows is miles and miles wide, and they brought it up on the biggest known navigational hazard in the Sound. I mean, that's just incredibly -- and now they want to go out in Cook Inlet? I mean, comparing Prince William to Cook Inlet, it's like a duck pond versus an ocean. I mean, the tides there, the power of that ocean is just astounding.

And I think that to think that you could actually drill there and not completely ruin it is just absolutely ludicrous. I mean, let's just look at this from common sense and history. It's absurd. And I don't want to live with this.

I mean, they're going to -- the people who are going to make money from this do not live here. They're just going to -- you won't see them at Eagle. They're just -- the money's going to go out, and then we're going to sit here and deal with it for the next -- just look at all this pollution and death. And I don't -- I live here. I don't want to deal with it.

So if it goes through, it's going to spill, it's going to kill. And it's not good. And what about -- I mean, this -- these birds that go from like South America all the way up to ANWR, they -- you know, this is a big stopover. They're going to come here, they're going to ingest all this oil, they're going to go and they're going to die. And other animals that depend on them, it's going to have -- the effect of this legislation could be worldwide in terms of environmental impact.

So, please, just stop it. I don't want to deal with it. Nobody else wants to deal with it. My kids don't want to deal with it. Thank you for coming and listening. I appreciate it.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. TERI SHUMAKER

Good evening. My name is Teri Shumaker. That's T-e-r-i S-h-u-m-a-k-e-r, Post Office Box 443, Anchor Point, Alaska.

tou.

I've been coming to Homer and Anchor Point as a tourist every year for the last four years. I spent all that time on the waters and on the beaches. My tourist dollars went to Homer residents who own the Homer businesses. I know that's true because in the last year, I've had the opportunity to meet all of those business owners.

I now live in this area because I want to continue to enjoy the way the colors of the water change as the atmospheric conditions change. I want to continue to enjoy the marine wildlife and walking on the beaches. I have just purchased property that has an outstanding view of Cook Inlet and the Kachemak Bay. I did what every other view property owner has done: I paid a premium for it. I spend much of my time outdoors enjoying the natural beauty here. When I'm in my own home, I want to look at the Kachemak Bay and lower Cook Inlet and enjoy it.

No matter how strict the controls are, there can be oil accidents. There will be pollution of the waters and the land due to normal day-to-day oil activities. If the proposed oil leases are canceled, our nation will not be adversely affected. We do not need oil from Cook Inlet. I say no to oil leases in Cook Inlet.

Before you leave Homer, please allow time to sit in the viewing area on Baycrest Hill. Turn off the car engine, don't talk, just look at the water for a while. You may notice

a calming effect. You may notice your stress level going down. You may also notice other cars coming into that viewing area. Some of the occupants of those cars will be visitors; most of the occupants of those cars are residents of Homer and Anchor Point.

Natural beauty is important to everyone's mental health and physical health. Oil exploration and production destroy natural beauty. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Does anybody else like to testify? Yes, sir.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DAVE LYON

Yeah, my name is Dave Lyon. I live in Homer. My mailing address is Box 47. The name is Dave L-y-o-n.

I've been here five years solid now, and I was up here on and off for five years before that. And in that time, I've worked as a charter fisher on the charter boats, a commercial fisherman, and I've worked for the State. I also enjoy going fishing on -- every opportunity I have.

The way I understand the DEIS is, ultimately, the results of this are going to adversely affect all of my professional avocations and all of my hobbies. Everything I do to make money here and everything I do with my money will be negatively affected by the results of oil drilling in lower

Cook Inlet.

I wasn't going to come here this evening because I don't necessarily believe that what we say here has any ultimate effect on the decisions that I think may have already been made. The reason I am here is because I hope I'm wrong. And I hope that by adding my voice to the voices of my friends and the people that I consider to be my family, who are here behind me, that you will hear us. And I cannot imagine you going forth from this meeting with anything other than the recommendation that this is not a good plan.

Oil drilling in lower Cook Inlet is not going to do us any good here in Homer. We're not going to get hired.

We're not going to work on the rigs. I'm not a rigger; my friends aren't riggers, and we don't know any riggers. They're going to come up from Louisiana and Arkansas, Texas, or even just down from Kenai. But those aren't jobs for us. Our jobs are going to be cleaning up the oil that washes up onto our shores. And to be perfectly honest, I think we'd rather be idle than employed cleaning up oil on our beaches.

Enough of the oil areas have been developed now for us to see what happens when they are developed. We need to put an end to this. It's simply not a feasible use of what's left of our undisturbed wilderness. And I think that it's pretty clear that I'm opposed to this lease sale. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you. Anybody else?

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

## (No audible response)

It looks like we have come to the close

of the evening. I do want to thank you all for coming.

really appreciate you coming out. We really appreciate the

MR. BROCK:

work you've done at looking at this and hearing your views on

6 | this.

We don't take this assignment lightly. We're not going to walk out of here tonight and say, 'Ah, forget it. It was just Homer.' Everything that was said here tonight will be read by every one of the staff that was involved in preparing this EIS. Every letter that's prepared -- I'm not going to read all the names and everything -- it will go into the official record. Those will all be read by everybody that's involved in preparing the EIS. They will either be answered individually, or if they are very similar to something else, they'll be answered in the Final EIS, if the decision is to proceed with the Final EIS. That decision has not been made yet.

If the decision is made to proceed with the Final EIS, that will -- that document will be prepared with either changing the Draft EIS or a response to each and every one of the comments that are in the Final EIS. And then it will be published. Then the major decision will be made whether the -- this lease sale will go forth. So -- and if the final deci- -- if the Final EIS is going to be published, it'll be published

in about a year from right now. I don't have that exact date, but about that. So you will know about what the time frames are if it's going to proceed.

I really want to thank the students. I wish there was more of them here tonight. They were very enthusiastic, and I really appreciated them coming.

MR. KILCHER: If I may, sir?

MR. BROCK: Yes.

MR. KILCHER: Say a very few words.

#### FURTHER PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. YULE KILCHER

I didn't realize that you were federal people. I thought you might know me. I'm probably the oldest Alaskan resident in this audience here. I helped write the Alaska Constitution. I was, for four years, a State Senator, Chairman of Resources, and so on. I know what's going on in Alaska the last 50, 60 years. I'm an immigrant from Switzerland. I have a family, children and grandchildren, two and a half dozen, here in Alaska. So I'm very concerned.

I understand the politics of the oil companies and so on, but I want to -- I want you gentlemen to understand that my background is one of pre-history. I studied archeology in the Sahara in 1934. I came to Alaska with specific reasons for having lost confidence in civilization. I've studied lost civilizations in Arabia, in the Gobi Desert. We are at the end term of an interesting historic epoch.

Gentlemen, the question is, on this escalating curve, where are we? How flat is the curve? How sharp is it? Where is the end? I have spoken to a lot of interesting people when I had a conference at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., very interesting persons that largely agreed with me.

And they would agree, and you gentlemen might agree, some of my wealthier business acquaintances in Alaska agree with me. They would like to see this area as a sanctuary -- sanctuary in the etymological sense of the word, something saint almost, as sanctuary where maybe you and your own children someday will take refuge when you don't want to be hit the fan (sic) within the next 20 or 30 years and possibly sooner. Good night.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: I really want to thank you all for coming, and we've got to clean up here when we get done. And I'm glad you stayed clear through the end. I really appreciate it. Thank you much. We're closed.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-entitled matter were concluded at 1:15 a.m.)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2

1

3	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	PAGE
4	Tanya Inga	9
5	Mary Ann Holthaus	11
6	Paul Seaton	11
7	Barbara McNinch	12
8	Lhasha McLean	13
9	David Paxton	15
10	Marla McPherson	17
11	Jeff Wraley	19
12	John Bushell	23
13	Gail Parsons	25
14	Joel Cooper	29
15	Charles Davis	37
16	Michael White (Horse Trader)	39
17	Daniel Zatz	41
18	Patty Lightcap	46
19	Bill Choate	47
20	Dora Coen	50
21	Deborah Oppenheim	51
22	Nina Faust	53
23	Claus Lotscher	58
24	Brother Isaiah	59
25	Julie Cesarine	61

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

2

1

3	PUBLIC TESTIMONY PAGE
4	Joy Post
5	Abby Laing 64
6	Larry Smith
7	Larry Kuznar
8	Richard Tyler
9	Craig Matkin
10	Michelle Jennings
11	Edgar Bailey
12	Michael Armstrong
13	Mako Haggerty
14	Yule Kilcher
15	Sallie Dodd-Butters
16	Dayton Butters
17	Nancy Hillstrand
18	David Hillstrand
19	Patrick McNamara
20	Emily Johngren
21	Rachel Adams
22	Eric Ringer
23	Steve Ruzanski
24	Ken Castner
25	Wendy Breiby

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

2

3	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	PAGE
4	Peggy Kleinleder	124
5	Jonathan Allen Kleinleder	126
6	Kima Butters	127
7	Richard "Bumppo" Bremicker	128
8	Sonja Tobiessen	134
9	Allison Teague	136
10	Margi Blanding	138
11	Michael Scott	141
12	Megan Corazza	144
13	Lauren Carlton	145
14	Linda Redman	150
15	Mike O'Meara	153
16	Linda Feiler	161
17	Josh Brooks	164
18	Dean Sundmark	165
19	Konrad Schaad	167
20	Todd Radmaker	168
21	Patricia King	169
22	Willy Dunne	173
23	Dan Levinson	176
24	Chrìs Chavasse	181
25	Eric Bremicker	186

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

2	
_	

3	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	PAG
4	Chris Herreid	187
5	Teri Shumaker	189
6	Dave Lyon	191
_ [		

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

## CERTIFICATION

ss.

1	L	
-	,	

3

4

STATE OF ALASKA

THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

BY: Cindy S.

Certified Court Reporter

That the foregoing pages contain a full, true, and correct transcript of proceedings in the above-entitled matter, transcribed by me, or at my direction and supervision, to the best of my knowledge and ability.

I, CINDY S. CARL, do hereby certify:

- That I have been certified for transcript services (2) by the United States Courts.
- (3) That I was certified for transcript services by the Alaska Court System prior to January 1, 1993.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED:

DATE: 3/25/95



1	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
2	MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
3	
4	
5	
6	OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT
7	PUBLIC HEARING
8	COOK INLET SALE 149
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Kodiak Borough Chambers Kodiak, Alaska
14	
15	Wednesday, March 8, 1995 7:00 o'clock p.m.
16	
17	
18	
19	MMS PANEL MEMBERS
20	Mr. Bob Brock Regional Supervisor, Leasing and Environment of the
21	Alaska OCS Region Mr. Barry Boudreau
22	Regional Supervisor for Field Operations Dr. Ray Emerson
23	DEIS Project Leader, Leasing and Environment Office
24	
25	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording. Transcript produced by transcription service.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

## KODIAK, ALASKA - WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1995

3 (On record at 7:00 p.m.)

4 | (Tape No. 1 of 1)

MR. BROCK: I think we'll go ahead and get started. First, I'll -- right off the bat, I'll apologize for the distance we are from you, but since that's the way the room is designed, we'll -- I hope that does not intimidate anybody from the standpoint that we're standing -- we're sitting behind these -- this desk here. It's not meant to be that way, but we want you to feel very at home and relaxed as possible.

Good afternoon, and welcome to the hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Federal Oil and Gas Lease Sale No. 149 in the Cook Inlet.

My name is Bob Brock, and I'm the Regional Supervisor for the Leasing and Environment Office of the Alaska OCS Region of the Minerals Management Service in Anchorage. Other panel members include Barry Boudreau, who is the Regional Supervisor for Field Operations in MMS in Anchorage, and Ray Emerson, who is the Project Leader on this Draft EIS preparation that we are having the public hearing on tonight.

This is the fifth and final public hearing to be held on this Draft EIS. We held a teleconference with Seldovia; we had a public hearing in Anchorage, Kenai, and Homer. The one in Anchorage was last Friday, the one in Kenai was Monday evening, and the one in Homer was last night.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive the views and comments and suggestions of interested individuals and representatives of local government and organizations on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement covers approximately 2 million acres which are being considered for leasing in the Cook Inlet planning area, or about 37 percent of the entire planning area.

The major goal of this sale, in accordance with the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, is to find out more precisely where the domestic energy supplies are, how much is there, and allow them to be produced where it is possible to do so in an environmentally safe manner.

We have the responsibility to fulfill the mandates set forth in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and its implementing regulations. In doing so, we strictly observe all the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammals Protection Act, Coastal Zone Management Act, and the Oil Pollution Act. In addition, MMS has in place a host of regulations and operating rules that are designed to assure continued safe and clean offshore oil and gas activities. There are many additional safeguards that I won't go into the detail tonight.

Discharges from OCS oil and gas exploration and production activities will be subject to the Environmental

Protection Agency's national pollution discharge elimination system, commonly referred to as the NPDES permits. Under a local memorandum of agreement between the Minerals Management Service and the Environmental Protective Agency, the MMS has agreed, on federal platforms in federal waters, to conduct the NPDES permit compliance inspections of OCS facilities in conjunction with normal drilling and production inspections.

Under this agreement, the MMS collects samples of discharges and provides them to EPA for independent analyses. The MMS has been conducting these NPDES permit compliance inspections in federal waters since 1989. We are aware that EPA recently fined companies in upper Cook Inlet for violation of their NPDES permit conditions relating to discharges that exceeded permit limits, mostly for sanitary and domestic wastes, but also for some oil and grease discharges.

The MMS recently completed a water quality study in Cook Inlet which examined hydrocarbon concentrations in water, sediments, and mussels and found no evidence of hydrocarbon contamination. The MMS study did not look for contaminants related to sanitary and domestic conditions. However, the study did perform sensitive life stage bioassays which indicated no harmful levels of contaminations in general. These study results are discussed in the Draft EIS, and a final report is available, if you are interested in it, by contacting our office.

approximately three years of preparation, which include such actions as the call for information, area identification, and scoping. You have been a part of this process through your earlier comments and are being asked once again to give us your comments. The Environmental Impact Statement is a very important element in the decision process. The law requires considerable consultation with the Governor to balance national needs with the well-being of local citizens.

We want everyone here to understand that MMS does not take this proposal lightly and that we approach all leasing decisions very cautiously and carefully. For example, as a result of the public input directly from people like yourselves here in Alaska, the MMS deleted a majority of the Shelikof Strait portion of the planning area, which included about 1.7 million acres.

Also, the Sale 149 Draft EIS contains mitigating measures that have, for the first time, been made a part of the proposed action at this early phase of the decision process, which also was a suggestion made right here in Alaska at public hearings. There are also additional potential mitigating measures analyzed in the EIS.

Another example of our attempts to be more responsive to public input is that concurrent with the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed notice of

sale is also available at this time for comment. In the past, the proposed notice of sale was provided after the release of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. By releasing it at this point in time, this is what the proposed notice of sale would look like based on the information in the Draft EIS.

I will call today's speakers in the order in which they have registered, and if you wish to speak but have not already signed in, please register with Dick Roberts, sitting back there by the door. We have just a few rules I'd like to ask you to follow to ensure that the hearing runs smoothly.

Please state your name, address, and organization or agency which you represent. Please spell your name so we get that properly in the transcript. And, please, if you could, we'd appreciate you holding your comments to about 10 minutes or less. If you have prepared written testimony, please give a copy to our court reporter, sitting right here on my left.

An official recorder will make a verbatim transcript of the hearing, and everything that is spoken when the hearing is in session will be recorded. Copies of the transcript are available from Mr. Robert Carl, sitting there, of Executary Court Reporting Services. And his phone number is (907) 272-4084. That's Anchorage, 272-4084.

The purpose of this hearing is to improve the quality of our Environmental Impact Statement before it is put in final form. Speakers will not be questioned unless a member of the

panel wishes to have some facts clarified or obtain additional information. We are interested in understanding your views about this Environmental Impact Statement.

The comment period for this document closes April 19th, 1995. Until that time, MMS will accept written comments and statements from anyone who would prefer to make written rather than oral comments. And those written comments and statements should be sent to our address that you can obtain from Mr. Dick Roberts back there if you so desire. Again, remember, the comment period for this Draft EIS closes on April 19th, 1995.

Looks like we have, at the present time, two, four, six, eight people that have registered to testify, and we'll start right at the top of the list with Kristin Stahl-Johnson.

(Pause)

MS. JOHNSON: I think there might other people who want to testify that didn't put asterisks on there.

MR. BROCK: Yes, and if you did not put an asterisk, when we get through the ones that did, well, I will call that from the floor so nobody has to feel like they're going to miss a chance to testify. I want to make sure we hear everybody.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. KRISTIN STAHL-JOHNSON

Okay. My name is Kristin Stahl-Johnson. That's K-r-i-s-t-i-n S-t-a-h-l-Johnson, P.O. Box 2661, Kodiak 99615. And I'm here representing the Kodiak Conservation Network.

Kodiak Conservation Network currently has 55 members, but we are not necessarily a membership organization but one that works with other organizations that have similar concerns to be able to be responsive to conservation concerns for the Kodiak region. KCN started as a -- it began as a response to the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and recognizing the impacts of that spill and oil issues on our personal and professional lives, KCN Board members are actively involved in the prevention, preparedness, and response planning for oil spills which would impact Kodiak -- have and would in the future.

We are also a member of the Oil Spill Regional Environmental Coalition, which has a seat on the Prince William
Sound RCAC; the Prince William Sound Regional Citizens Advisory
Council; and participate in the Cook Inlet Regional Citizens
Advisory Council. And we're a member of the Alaska Marine
Conservation Council, which is a statewide marine conservation
organization.

Kodiak Conservation Network opposes oil and gas development in the OCS of the Outer Continental Shelf of lower Cook Inlet and Shelikof Strait for the same reasons that we oppose this sale when it included the whole of Shelikof Strait. At this point, there are clearly no economic benefits for Kodiak and only the risk that is taken with expanding oil development. Currently, we have risk of oil spills from both Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet.

And depending on how you read your Environmental Impact Statement on the different ways that -- the different scenarios that you can lay out there, we can experience as much as a 72-percent probability of another major oil spill. That is an unacceptable expectation of risk for an area that is so rich in fisheries and natural resources, biological resources.

OCS 149 would be the first sale in the Exxon Valdez oil spill region, and this proposal is completely inconsistent with the Trustees agencies' responsibility for restoration of damaged resources from the oil spill. The Kodiak Island Borough, which includes the Barren Islands and the western shore of Shelikof Strait, received more recorded miles of oiled shoreline than any other — than the entire rest of the EVOS region, the Exxon Valdez oil spill region. In other words, more oil can potentially hit and damage Kodiak from a major oil spill than any place else.

And this is because Kodiak is essential to the biological currents and -- essential to what I call the biological pump of the Gulf of Alaska. We're essential to the main habitat region for fisheries and marine production. And therefore, it's critical habitat for all the resources, all the biological resources in the Gulf of Alaska. We can list all the species that are named for marine mammals and fish and crustaceans that are in the EIS. Their abundance in the Gulf of Alaska is highest around this island.

Excuse me a moment. I'm not entirely prepared to go smoothly here.

(Pause)

There -- even though there was such a significant amount of oiled shoreline, there was no -- there has been no significant research on the long-term impacts of EVOS in our effort. And though most of the effort has been focused on the Sound, because everyone considers the Exxon Valdez a Prince William Sound spill, we still don't know what the long-term impacts are here.

We're downstream from Prince William Sound; we're downstream from Cook Inlet, and definitely downstream from the proposed OCS 149. It's inconceivable to the Kodiak Conservation Network that we should further jeopardize the richest --some of the richest fisheries resources in the world by expanding oil production. The same justifications which sought --which created the buy-back of the Bristol Bay lease sales, stopped the joint Chukchi Sea sale, created the buy-back of Kachemak Bay sales in the past are all the same justifications of why we should not have oil development in -- or continue to expand that oil development to impact Kodiak.

Having worked for four years on spill prevention response and preparedness development on -- in working with the Prince William Sound RCAC, I can definitely state that we are not there yet in terms of prevention and response. There is no

significant oil industry effort to prevent or protect Kodiak outside of Prince William Sound or the lower Cook Inlet from existing oil spills and existing Cook Inlet operations.

There's no vessel traffic system in Cook Inlet.

There's no protection at Hinchinbrook -- outside of Hinchinbrook Entrance for vessels that leave Prince William Sound, travel around the Kenai Peninsula, and enter Cook Inlet carrying the same North Slope crude that they're highly protected (sic) inside the Inlet and we -- inside the Sound. And we continue to be exposed to those risks, and there is no demonstration of, I would call it, good faith to date that we will be protected from another major oil spill.

There's -- there are no double-hulled tankers now. The double-hulled tankers aren't required until the year nine -- 2015. That still puts us way far away from any significant prevention. And currently, oil spill response plans do not fully utilize the logistic resources on Kodiak Island to prevent another spill -- to respond to another spill. There are a lot of federal requirements, a lot of legislation that you discussed earlier that theoretically put safeguards in place to protect us. But these safeguards are mostly lip service since there's no money or enforcement capability behind them.

The reason that there were 4,200 violations recited in the NPDES permits in upper Cook Inlet, and why the EPA took

so long, eight years, to bring enforcement action against those folks, is because they don't have the enforcement capability that these laws are supposed to protect us with. And on top of that, those rigs are self-reporting. So if there's 4,200 violations, what was it that wasn't reported?

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, the National Environmental Protection Act, the Clean Water Act have all been, at one point or another -- and all the environmental protection acts have been violated by the oil industry, but they have -- but there hasn't been an ability to really -- to -- a consistent, tenacious expectation that they will respond to those and protect us from their own -- from their pollution.

On top of that, none of the -- the proposed OCS 149 and the current responses to -- or the current planning to respond to oil spills does not fully consider the human or socioeconomic impacts and repercussions of a spill. The social research after the Exxon Valdez clearly demonstrates that there are extreme stress impacts from technological disasters on natural resource dependent communities.

Those -- the kinds of things that undermine people's connection with where they are, their sense of place, their sense of home, their sense of community, their ability to trust their neighbors, their ability to understand how different people are going to respond under a situation of stress, and

б

the opportunistic situation that happened in the Exxon Valdez when there was a lot of money available for a few people, and it didn't -- certainly didn't go throughout the community.

There's a sense of apathy that -- apparent sense of apathy, but it's more a sense of cynicism in our community because we have not been treated with the respect and dignity that we deserved in 1989 and we continue to -- that continues not to be the case today. The National Science Foundation makes it very clear that no -- none -- no more oil lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf should go forward without a clear understanding of these socioeconomic impacts, as well as the biological impacts, which we have very little understanding of those in Alaska.

And we, as a smaller population, are taking the largest hit in the Outer Continental Shelf nationwide because we have fewer population to oppose and less representation in Congress. But it doesn't mean that it's any better to do it here than off the coast of California or Oregon or Maine or Maryland.

I can go on and on about why OCS 149 is a bad idea for Kodiak. We have the potential and have been in the top first or second ports in this country, in the top ten ports in the world in terms of fisheries landings, in the value of our resources, in the value of -- and the investment that goes into those resour- -- to harvesting those resources. Oil spills put

1 all of that at risk. It's a long-term resources benefit versus a short-2 3 term gain for the oil industry, and there's no benefit for this community or for the nation. And I respectfully request that 4 5 we do not go forward with OCS 149. Thank you. 6 MR. BROCK: Thank you, Kristin. 7 (Applause) 8 MR. BROCK: Jane Eisemann. 9 Eisemann (pronounced correctly). MS. EISEMANN: 10 MR. BROCK: Eisemann? 11 MS. EISEMANN: Mm hmm (affirmative). 12 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. JANE EISEMANN 13 My name is Jane Eisemann. MR. BROCK: How do you spell that? 14 15 BY MS. EISEMANN (Resuming): 16 J-a-n-e E-i-s-e-m-a-n-n, P.O. Box 192, Kodiak, 17 Alaska 99615. 18 I'm here this evening representing Kodiak High School 19 fisheries science students. I'll be reading a few letters; 20 they were either unable to attend or are uncomfortable speaking 21 in public. So I'll be representing them. 22 Written Testimony of Mr. Matt Lohr (ph): 23 "Good evening. My name is Matt Lohr (ph), 24 and I am a student at Kodiak High School. 25 spent last summer gillnetting in Larsen Bay, and

next summer I plan to seine around Kodiak
Island. I also plan to fish Kodiak waters for
salmon in the summer for as long as there are
fish to catch.

"With the possible Lease Sale 149, the chances for another oil spill are increased. I don't want to spend another summer cleaning up oil that was spilled by greedy people trying to make money. I think this lease sale will only cause problems between fishermen and the oil industry.

"Thank you."

#### Written Testimony of Mr. Chris Arndt

"Hello. My name is Chris Arndt, and I have fished dungeness crab for three years and halibut for two and am currently fishing salmon in the summer. I am planning to fish salmon around Kodiak for many years to come.

"Lease Sale 149 could, and has a 72-percent chance of changing mine and many other careers in the summer. If there is an oil spill around Kodiak, it will affect the whole island. Because Kodiak is based on the fishing industry, without fishing, Kodiak is nothing.

"An oil spill could really ruin things for

Kodiak, so I am 100-percent against Lease Oil Sale 149.

"Sincerely, Chris Arndt."

And this letter is submitted by Jeremy Votz (ph):

Written Testimony of Mr. Jeremy Votz (ph)

"I am a fisherman and depend on Kodiak Island's natural fishing resources to earn money. I have crewed for my father's boat since I was six and am planning to go out salmon fishing again this summer.

"The Exxon Valdez oil spill had many bad effects on my family when it closed salmon fishing down around the island, which, up to this date, we are still paying for. Even more important than my family's well-being is the fishing industry as a whole and the environment.

"If Lease Sale 149 goes through, it puts all that I have mentioned in jeopardy of destruction. With the high-risk factor of an oil spill at 72 percent, ocean currents that would carry the oil down to Kodiak Island, it would have a very destructive effect."

"Closing another salmon season and killing thousands of animals is not my idea of a great plan, and with all the pollution already on the

earth, we do not need any more. We need to cut down, and by starting with not letting the lease sale go through, we would be off to a good start.

"Letting a large oil company, that in the most likelihood is corrupt, into a pristine wilderness should not even be a choice. And definitely not a choice of someone that does not have any stake into the land except to make money.

"Sincerely, Jeremy Votz (ph)."

## Written Testimony of Mr. Mark Woitell (ph)

"Hi. My name is Mark Woitell (ph), and I would like to make a few points.

"I think that you people shouldn't lease Cook Inlet because you will be killing lots of animals on Kodiak Island. My brother and my uncles are skippers on the Pursuit and the Provider, which were the first two scallopers here in Kodiak.

"If the oil companies tend to transport oil by a pipeline or oil tankers, Kodiak is bound to get hit by an oil spill, which will hurt Kodiak's wildlife tremendously and might even get rid of our salmon fishing industry as well

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

as other fisheries. Kodiak cannot go through the like of the Exxon spill again. That spill already killed many sea otters, as well as many birds, some sea lions, and some seals.

"We had many cleanup crews on Kodiak to get rid of the oil, but if the tankers come to Cook Inlet, this could be an ongoing thing that has to be stopped. Just look at all the arguments and fights between community members, not to mention all the oil that was spilled, too.

"This part of Cook Inlet and the Shelikof
Strait cannot be sold to some oil company
because Kodiak will have a large chance of
having another oil spill. Take a look at all
the money that was spent trying to clean the
Exxon mess up. The people of the oil industry
cannot buy Cook Inlet, for it will kill all of
the animals and the plant life on Kodiak Island.

"Respectfully, Mark Woitell (ph)."

And this one's submitted by Aaron Star (ph):

Written Testimony of Mr. Aaron Star (ph)

"I have lived in Kodiak for almost seven or eight years now, and as far as selling the Cook Inlet waters to an oil company goes, I don't think that it's worth the risk of another chance

of an oil spill. The last one screwed everything up bad enough.

"Look at all the birds and animals it killed, all the fights and arguments it caused, all the time and money that was wasted. We don't need to build all that stuff out there anyway. Just leave things like they are now, and give the other resources a chance to balance again.

"Sincerely, Aaron Star (ph)."

And I'd like to close with a poem that was one of my students' way of making a testimony. And this is submitted by Jodi Holfort (ph). It's called "My Plea":

### Written Testimony of Ms. Jodi Holfort

"I remember that day when nature went astray
The island awoke, the awakening rude,
Death and destruction brought by the crude.
The birds, they just fell,
The wings stopped their beat.
They would nevermore walk on two feet.
The fish, they felt, too, the pain,
Nothing to save them, not even the rain.
Not just the birds, not just the fish,
The entire island threw up their wish.
It happened before; it'll happen again.

1.8

All I've asked is where to begin.
This is it; my beginning is here.
And so I face you, void of fear.
Save my island,
Save it, please.
Don't let it pass into the breeze.
Stop the chance where it will start.
I want no more bleeding inside my heart."
And that was submitted by Jodi Holfort (ph).
Thank you for your time.
MR. BROCK: Thank you.
(Applause)
MR. BROCK: Brian Johnson. I can't read that.
(Laughter, simultaneous speech)
MR. BROCK: Forgive me if I don't pronounce your name
right.
MR. JOHNSON: That's okay.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. BRIAN JOHNSON
My name is Brian Johnson, B-r-i-a-n J-o-h-n-s-o-n,
Box 2661, Kodiak. I think the high school kids said it all.
But I'm a commercial fisherman; I'm a salmon fisher-
man. And I've been working on commercial fishing vessels,
tugboats, and research ships in these waters around Shelikof

since 1978. And let me tell you, the northern Shelikof is not

Trading Bay, guys. It is unbelievable what it can do out

there, not only with the currents and the way they run, with the weather the way it goes, it's a pretty wild place to be doing any kind of business. It's a place to be avoided a lot of times in the wintertime.

And we all know which way the water goes. And the high school kids know it real well. Everything that happens all up and through the Gulf ends up on our beaches. That's why we have a red cedar all the way from Southeast Alaska that ends up on our beaches here. With the way the water runs and brings things in, that's probably why this is such a productive place fishing-wise, as it also deposits everything else here.

And my only experience with the oil industry has been the Exxon Valdez incident, which everybody knows well. And also, I spent a couple months working on Foss tugboats running anchors for a pipeline barge in Trading Bay on the Marathon Platform, which collapsed once and blew out twice. So I wasn't so impressed with how that thing went up there.

But, you know, there's just -- the reasons could go on and on and on. Look what happened with the Drift River situation with the volcanic eruptions. This is an extremely high volcanic area. We've had Mount Redoubt; we've had Mount Spurr. We've had times when Mount Augustine was erupting. And there was one time, I don't -- if it -- they weren't sure it was going to erupt. I remember a few years ago when they were concerned about the proximity of the fishing fleets to the

area. So not only do you have an extreme weather situation up there, you have a tremendous amount of volcanic activity up there going on all the time.

And again, everybody's already said that you were looking at a long-term, you know, investment for a lot of fishermen. There's -- the economics that can be gained out of the fisheries could go on and on and on forever. The world fishery is in a state of crisis right now, and this area in the northern gulf is one place where they're still hanging on. You know, we're still trying to hang onto them. And I don't see the tradeoff for short-term, you know, gains of the oil research versus the long term of the fishing industries.

You have a fledgling tourist industry that's wanting to develop. You have Katmai National Refuge, and you have -- or the monument. You have the Kodiak Refuge. You have tremendous salmon fisheries up and down this side of the island and tremendous salmon fisheries down in Chignik as well. And everything that goes on up there combines and goes shooting right down those straits.

And you can sit on the beaches in Swikshak Lagoon and that area, and down the line close to where the southern end of this lease sale is, and in the springtime you'll see just bears down there on the beach digging clams. You know, that's what they eat. So, you know, there's a tremendous amount of wildlife which people are starting to, you know, use as a tourism

thing as well.

And I don't -- you know, just this -- for the sheer reason of not wanting to sit out there in northern Shelikof and look across to Cape Douglas on a clear day and see an oil rig out there. I don't necessarily want to see that. And that in itself is enough.

And -- excuse me. I'm not very well prepared. I had a couple other things to say.

I just want to see some long -- some thinking ahead, longer than 15- or 20-year potential with oil rigs and oil wells. And what -- it was stated earlier we were the number one fishing port in this country for a while, and we want to build our fish stocks so we can be that again. And I don't see, in this situation, where it's going to be a real compatible thing 'cause the potential for disaster is there.

I've been on boats all my life, and I know things go wrong. You know, the best intentions can always go wrong.

I've seen it many, many times. And we can't afford to have another accident like we had years ago, or increase that chance of something.

And I really hope you reconsider what's going on there because, again, lower Cook Inlet isn't Trading Bay. That place is really sheltered to what you're looking at down here. I mean, just take a few boat rides in the wintertime across that area, and it's enough to make a believer out of you. And

I really don't want to see oil rigs sitting out there. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

1.0

1.6

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Debra. I'm not even going to try the last name (laugh).

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. DEBRA NIELSEN

My name's Debra Nielsen, D-e-b-r-a N-i-e-l-s-e-n, Box 8381, Kodiak.

I know, you know, all of us use fuel; all of the fishing industry uses fuel. And somebody said to me before I came to the meeting today, 'You don't have any right to oppose this unless you're not going to use fossil fuels.' And I'm -- am sympathetic because we do consume so much fuel, and I know we have to get it somewhere, and no one wants it to happen where there might be an adverse impact to them or to their community.

I think what Brian said is probably the clearest argument against this particular sale that I can think of, and that's the location of it. It's just the roughest water you could pick. It isn't something that we can guarantee will be safe. Nature does more damage in this area than we can even believe sometimes. I mean, you know, I've crabbed over there in the winter, and most of us have been over there even in the summer in blows. What -- you can't predict that everything

| will go well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I have first-hand knowledge, and a lot of us do, of the ineptitude of the techniques we have right now available to us to clean up a spill. So for those reasons, I'm opposed to the sale. And thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Mary Forbes?

MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: She's gone.

MR. BROCK: She's gone. Okay. Brian -- Brian.

MR. JOHNSON: Do I get to go again?

(Laughter)

MR. LARGE: I'm Brian Large.

MR. BROCK: Large.

MR. LARGE: 1710 Samantof (ph), Kodiak, Alaska.

MR. BROCK: L-a-r-q-e?

MR. LARGE: Yeah.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. BRIAN LARGE

Hi. I'm Brian Large. I was born in Kodiak, Alaska, and I've lived here all my life. I'm 15 years of age, and I go to Kodiak High School. In the summer I fish for salmon on the Fishing Vessel Karen K.

I remember the Exxon Valdez tanker spilling millions of barrels of North Slope crude oil into the Prince William Sound nearly six years ago. The current pushed the oil our

way, covering Kodiak's beaches and killing millions of animals.

The salmon season had to be closed down. Some people got paid off -- (clearing throat) excuse me -- but others didn't. Some friendships were lost, and that day changed the future for many Alaskans.

The Lease Sale 149 will give Alaskans 72-percent probability of another major oil spill. I don't think Kodiak could take another disastrous oil spill. We have suffered enough. Do not let Lease Sale 149 happen. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Mmm. S-t-e-e-d-e-b-u-l-c-e-r?
(Laughter)

MR. BROCK: I'm not trying to criticize your writing.

MS. STUDEBAKER: Is my writing really that bad

(laugh)?

MR. BROCK: No, no, I just -- it's my glasses need adjusting.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. STACY STUDEBAKER

Okay. The first name is Stacy, S-t-a-c-y, and the second name is Studebaker, S-t-u-d-e-b-a-k-e-r. Post Office Box 970, Kodiak 99615.

And I'm speaking as a local resident first. I am opposed to the Oil Lease Sale 149. The Exxon Valdez oil spill devastated this community in 1989, and we're still suffering

the effects. And we just can't take any other chances for future oil spills here.

I'm also a member of the Kodiak State Parks Community Advisory Board. And we've written a couple of letters on past oil lease sales regarding the vulnerability of Shuyak Island State Park, a new area that's a premiere state -- ocean state park with wildlife and archeol- -- many archeological sites. And it was hammered in 1989 by the Exxon Valdez oil and is still rebounding and recovering from that. Not only the wildlife, but also the archeological sites there were just really messed up from the oil -- not only the oil, but from the oil spill cleanup crews.

So I just want to make it short. Our natural resources here are far too precious and vulnerable to risk another oil spill. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Mike.

FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: He's not even trying.

(Laughter)

MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Doesn't even give it a try.

(Laughter)

MR. BROCK: I don't want to goof it up like I did the

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

3 4

1

2

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

. -

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Executar

last one.

MR. SIROFCHUCK: I've learned that when I hear Mike and a pause, that's me.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MIKE SIROFCHUCK

My name is Mike Sirofchuck, and that's spelled S-i-r-o-f-c-h-u-c-k. I live at Box 970, Kodiak. And I'm here tonight as a local resident to oppose the Cook Inlet Federal Lease Sale 149. Some of the things I'll mention have already been mentioned this evening, but I think they're important enough to be reinforced.

There was mention that four oil companies operating platforms in Cook Inlet have committed over 4,200 violations of the Federal Clean Water Act. I think as we listen to the news every evening on CNN or NPR and we hear that our Congress is becoming more and more anti-regulatory -- we're talking about amendments proposed by Alaska Senators to freeze federal regulations -- this is not the time to be building oil platforms in a dangerous place like Cook Inlet.

If anything, these oil platforms need tight, strict regulations. They need close enforcement; they need to be watched very closely, and they need to be regulated and monitored very closely. And the mood of the government now seems to be moving away from that, and I think that's too dangerous a situation to take the chance.

I'm a high school teacher here, and I've been teach-

ing here since 1987. And I saw some effects of the oil spill that probably we don't hear much about because they're sort of hard to quantify. But you see what happens to kids when you see what happens when their families can't work over the summer. Or sometimes they feel as if they've prostituted themselves because they have to work for Exxon in an oil spill cleanup in order to make the money they would have made fishing that they weren't able to do.

There's a social cost; there's a psychological cost.

And we're still feeling the effects of that now. There's a
mental health cost. And I feel that nothing that this oil
lease sale could generate could offset taking the -- you know,
we can't take the chance of this sort of thing happening again.

We're talking now -- our Governor's talking about wanting to export Alaska oil. It seems to me if we have enough oil that we can be exporting it to other countries, we don't really need to be going out and drilling more at this time.

Let's leave it there. That's money in the bank. There's no sense going out for it when we don't really need to.

So basically, I just want to say that it's unacceptable to go ahead with these oil leases. I think our best thing to do, and the best thing for our community, is to make sure there'll be no oil spills, at least from this area, and that is not to allow drilling in the Cook Inlet. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

\_\_\_

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Rita (sic) Allan? No, apparently, that's not the right first name.

(Laughter)

MR. BROCK: Is it Pete?

(Inaudible response, laughter)

MR. BROCK: Okay. That was my other guess (laugh).

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. PETER ALLAN

Good evening. My name is Peter Allan. It's Peter,
P-e-t-e-r, A-l-l-a-n, P.O. Box 2160, 2-1-6-0, Kodiak. I'm
mostly here just to get myself on record and echo the other
comments. I'm not real well informed; I haven't read EIS. I
glanced at it briefly, but I'm a busy guy and that's a big
document. So on behalf of all the other shy, not terribly well
informed people that may not get up here, I want to, you know,
represent them maybe.

But a couple things I'd like to say is that, you know, the EIS says that spills are likely out there. Then as people have told you, you can't clean them up, and I think the EIS acknowledges that you can't clean them up. The only way that they'll get cleaned up, to some degree, is when they hit the beaches, and that's a poor way of doing business.

But, you know, I'm sure that you guys know how these skimmers and stuff work in more than about eight-inch seas, which you get about a few hours a year in this drilling area --

not many, you know. Not much -- not even two days a year probably. So you can't clean them up, and you know that going in, and you know that you're likely to have spills going in. So what are we talking about? We're talking about death. About death.

We're talking about sea lions. You're drilling right next to the Barren Islands that were decimated in 1989. The murre population was -- I forget how many thousands and thousands and thousands of birds were killed there and collected there out of the Barrens, a major rookery area. And they haven't recovered. And who knows if they ever will?

Sea lions are a big problem. I'm a fisherman, and I've got my own small boat here and fish here, as do most folks -- a lot of folks in this town. It's the backbone of this town. Sea lions are right now on the threatened species list, and they're bordering on endangered. Any stress and strain on them could lower the populations to the level where they are classified as endangered species, which would have the effect of probably shutting down large portions of all the fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska. It would shut down me. It would shut down the draggers. It would shut down a lot of people, not just around Kodiak but all over the place, if they get endangered.

And most of the fishermen and the fishing industry has been very conscious of that for a number of years and is

trying to be very conscientious in their fishing practices to avoid this problem. And a good oil spill might precipitate it -- boom -- and all the years we've been doing this, you know, trying to avoid this problem, is gone. So I want to make that point. It's real important.

I want to get a little bit personal now about corporate responsibility in the big oil business. I -- you know, other people have touched on other things, but Exxon put out a lot of money in a smoke and mirrors cleanup operation and mitigation to fishermen and impacted people. But they haven't made me whole. That was the phrase that was going around in 1989. Exxon, 'Oh, we're going to make you whole. We're going to make you whole.' I don't feel that I have been compensated for lost opportunity in 1989, and the effects of the 1989 spill have rippled on down through the years in the salmon fishery, and they're still impacting me.

I basically sat around in 1989 and twiddled my thumbs because I couldn't go fishing, and Exxon didn't deem me to be a worthy candidate to go clean up. So I'm still being impacted by the inequities of the way the cleanup hiring situation was run, in other words. Our fleet makeup was totally changed by the haves and the have-nots. Bus-billionaires (sic) is what we called them. All of a sudden, maybe 20 percent of the people in the fleet that I fish in went out and bought big new boats, big new gear, fancy rigs. It's hard to compete with them.

They're the haves; I'm a have-not.

So I'm not too impressed by Exxon's corporate responsibility. I have not been made whole. They have not mitigated. They did a big PR campaign, and I guess the media bought into it, and the people down in the Lower 48 have. I'm real sad about that.

I guess that's all I've got to say. Thanks.

MR. BROCK: Could I ask one question? I failed to -I didn't see the tie-in, and maybe I just missed a point, but
when you said that the -- if an oil spill came along and lowered the sea lion population, that would shut down the fishery.
I was wondering why would -- if it was a proven fact that the
oil spill lowered the sea lions, why would that shut down the
fishery? I....

MR. ALLAN: Well, because they will go on the endangered species list. And anything, when things are on the endangered species list....

MR. BROCK: Oh, I see your tie-in. Okay.

MR. ALLAN: ....anything can -- any possible things that can impact it -- in other words, the oil can cause it, but anybody else.....

MR. BROCK: Okay. I....

MR. ALLAN: .....is going to be affected by it.

MR. BROCK: ....missed that, and I was.....

MR. ALLAN: Okay.

1 MR. BROCK: Okay. Thank you. 2 (Applause) 3 MR. BROCK: That's all we have registered. Is there 4 anybody else that would like to testify? 5 MR. ROBERTS: I've got another sign-up 6 MR. BROCK: Oh, I'm sorry, Dick. Is there any --7 while he's bringing that up, is there somebody -- are you on the list? 8 9 MS. COBIS: No, I'm not. 10 MR. BROCK: Okay. Well, come ahead, and while he's bring the list up, we'll..... 11 12 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. ROSE COBIS 13 My name is Rose Cobis, R-o-s-e C-o-b-i-s, Box 2875, 14 Kodiak, Alaska. 15 I am not a fishing person, but I feel that my husband 16 and my income and life in Kodiak, and everyone else in this 17 community, is directly dependent on the fishing industry. because of that, I'm a bit surprised that half the town is not 18 19 here to testify against this oil lease. 20 And I would just like to go on record to say that we 21 need to be a little bit more cautious about these things and to 22 encourage anyone who hasn't made how they feel known in this 23 community, to write letters, or to get busy because, really, 24 there should be more people here. Thank you. 25 MR. BROCK: Thank you.

1

# (Applause)

2

# MR. BROCK: Mary Jacobs?

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MARY JACOBS

My name is Mary Jacobs, M-a-r-y J-a-c-o-b-s, Box 3080. And I apologize for not being better prepared, but I want to speak out against this lease sale.

And I'm -- I've been a fisherman around Kodiak Island since 1971. I've had my own boat since 1979. And I'm very familiar with these waters; they're treacherous waters. The currents regularly go between three and five knots, and there's williwaws that come down off the mainland that -- when it can be flat calm, and the rest of the island, it can be blowing there 60, 70 miles an hour. And I just don't think it's a safe place to put an oil rig.

I don't think -- it'd be very unlikely that there would be days when there can be an initial response in this You know, you can have an initial response in Prince William Sound; it's a lake compared to this, or in upper Cook And that, I think, in this kind of situation, I think the oil would be free to go wherever it would want to go and impact the beaches.

And I'm sure some would dissipate because of the weather, but we'd still -- you know, there's no place to -- it would be dangerous. And that's -- you know, when you're looking at oil response, they -- if it's dangerous, they don't send people out there, and it -- this would be a dangerous place to have any -- to have people out there trying to clean up things as it came off of a rig or off of a tanker that was getting loaded out there.

But, you know, I -- every -- I agree with everything that's been said here. A lot has been said. I'm going to try to cover a couple other things.

But I've been participating in -- on a committee with Cook Inlet RCAC for the past almost five years. And from the time I got on, we recommended a tug to be an escort tug in Cook Inlet, and there still is no escort tug. Cook Inlet is still the only place in the western world where a tanker is routinely docked and undocked without tug assist. And this is the one thing that everybody that's looked into this feels like it's important, is that, Are the oil companies showing good faith if they continue fighting having a tug in Cook Inlet? And this is a continuation of that.

I just don't see -- I just can't see opening up leasing to companies that have, over and over, shown bad faith. And, you know, that gets to the Exxon Valdez, which you can see we still have some serious feelings about. 1989 was the only year in 10 years I haven't -- I didn't own a boat. And, you know, so I wasn't -- didn't have something to have out there to be leased. I didn't have a permit that was going to be active to get a big claim. And -- but I have a long-term investment

in this fishery. You know, and it's not like everybody that's fishing, if there's an oil spill, can go oil spill cleaning and have a tradeoff that way. They don't take -- it doesn't take the place, you know.

I got back into the fisheries, you know, the -- and thinking that things would be pretty much like they were. But there's been a real perception problem with the fisheries in this area, you know, this area, Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet, since the spill. You know, whereas I had the same crew for years before that, the crews went on to other things. There's better things to do now than fishing in Alaska. The prices are down.

The Ikolik River, which is one of the biggest red runs on Kodiak Island, has -- had over-escapement the year of the oil spill, and it essentially wasn't opened last year, and it won't be opened this year, and because of the reduced runs and the reduced prices. Whether or not the Exxon Valdez is at fault for all of that, it's part of it, and the perception of fishing is just starting to recover. And it's starting to look a little bit better for the future, but there was some real damage done.

And right now, I'm struggling to keep a boat that -- and while Exxon fights paying off the lawsuit that -- you know, and I imagine it's going to be 10 years. There's going to be a bunch of us that were involved in the fishery in 1987, '88,

'89, and '90 that won't be around when those payments finally come out. And that does not show me good faith.

And let's see. The hatcheries here on Kodiak Island, the hatchery, doesn't have boom. We don't have any protective boom on Kodiak Island. You know, well, we have some, but we don't have any amount. If there's a spill in Prince William Sound, the boats that are signed up with Alyeska will get called to Prince William Sound to respond there, and it doesn't leave boats to protect the Kodiak Island waters.

You know, I don't feel like we're any better prepared for dealing with an oil spill now than we were in 1989. Prince William Sound is better prepared; they've got, you know, a world class response system there. But it's all for responding in the Sound, and we're down current. And we've been, you know, telling them we need some protection. You know, we need something. We need -- you know, we've got areas that are sensitive here, and we know the oil's going to come here, and we haven't got so much as boom to put across in front of our hatchery.

So anyway, I say I see bad faith, and I don't see that these corporate citizens deserve to be allowed a chance to lease these waters. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Bruce Short.

Executary Court Reporting 626 Cordova, Suite 104 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 272-4084

1 2

1

(Pause)

2

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

1.8

19 20

21

2.2 23

24

25

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. BRUCE SHORT

My name's Bruce Short. My last name's spelled S-h-o-r-t. My address is Box 4 in Kodiak.

I'm a lifelong Kodiak resident, and it just seems to me that this is a very high-risk venture in a very resourcerich area with terrible weather conditions. I live on the beach in a protected bay, and in the last oil spill, there was a little bit of oil that made it into my beach, but I feel with the greater potential, more development, the chances of having greater and greater impacts are becoming a greater reality.

So I just want to oppose this lease proposal. you.

> MR. BROCK: Thank you.

> > (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Linda Freed.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. LINDA FREED

It's spelled My name's Linda Freed. Thank you. L-i-n-d-a F-r-e-e-d. I'm the Community Development Director for the Kodiak Island Borough.

I'm here tonight to remind you of the Kodiak Island Borough's official position on Lease Sale 149. The two documents I'm going to reference, you already have copies of. will provide you with the current policy perspective of the Kodiak Island Borough Assembly as they've adopted in their

resolutions and the documents I'm about to refer to.

The Kodiak Island Borough staff will be reviewing the EIS and will present more detailed written comments to you based on these resolutions and how they relate to the information we see in the EIS. In addition, we will be looking at the EIS for perhaps inaccuracies and items that have been overlooked as part of the direct environmental review and the information provided about our community in that document.

The first resolution that I'd like to refer to is
Resolution 91-49, and it was a resolution of the Kodiak Island
Borough Assembly commenting on the Request for Interest and
Comments for Proposed Oil and Gas Lease Sale 149. And I guess
before I read this resolution, the reason that these resolutions are the policy bases for the Kodiak Island Borough's
position is because the Kodiak Island Borough Assembly has not
taken any subsequent action to this date.

"Whereas, on September 3rd, 1991, the
Kodiak Island Borough received Notice from the
Minerals Management Service of a Request for
Interest and Comments for Proposed Oil and Gas
Lease Sale 149, Cook Inlet and upper Shelikof
Strait,

"And whereas, the Kodiak Island Borough has gone on record as opposing oil exploration in the Cook Inlet planning area in general and in

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Shelikof Strait specifically for the last 12 years,

"And whereas, the Kodiak Island Borough and its residents are still recovering from the negative effects of the Exxon Valdez oil spill,

"And whereas, the Federal OCS National Gas and Oil Resource Management Comprehensive Plan of 1992 through 1997, which establishes Lease Sale 149, has not even been adopted yet,

"And whereas, the Kodiak Island Borough has urged that oil and gas leasing and exploration not take place in the Cook Inlet planning area until the long-term impacts of the Exxon Valdez oil spill have been established,

"And whereas, the Kodiak Island Borough is additionally concerned about the potential toxic effects of drilling muds used by the oil industry on the resource-rich habitat in the Cook Inlet planning area,

"Now, therefore be it resolved by the Assembly of the Kodiak Island Borough that, the Kodiak Island Borough supports delay of Lease Sale 149 until:

"(1) the long-term impacts of the Exxon

Valdez oil spill are established and can be used

as a basis for implementing mitigation methods
to protect existing coastal resources,

"(2) regulations are implemented that will

- "(2) regulations are implemented that will protect coastal habitats from toxic drilling muds used by the oil industry,
- "(3) regulations are implemented that will allow for the reduction or elimination of gear conflicts between the oil industry and the fishing industry; for example, seasonal drilling restrictions, and
- "(4) the oil industry proves that it is capable of and willing to clean up the projected maximum oil spill that could occur during oil and gas exploration."

The second document that I'll refer to, and I believe this was also brought to your attention at the Kenai public hearing by Mayor Don Gilman, is the Tri-Borough Position Paper on this lease sale. This particular position paper was put together with three boroughs that are in the spill-impacted area, that is, the Kenai Peninsula Borough, the Kodiak Island Borough, and the Lakin (ph) Peninsula Borough.

This position paper identifies five critical issues that the boroughs believed must be addressed in the lease sale's EIS. And that's why I said we will go back to this document and review the EIS in light of this position paper.

And if those five issues are not addressed in the lease sale review process, the boroughs have stated that they have grave reservations about supporting the lease sale. And I will briefly identify what those five items are:

One, the belief is there should be no offhshore loading of tankers should the sale go ahead.

Two, specific plans to minimize and avoid commercial fishing gear conflicts with exploration and development of oil. And that item was referenced in the previous resolution.

The oil exploration companies must have adequate spill prevention and response capability. And you've heard concern about how that capability might be addressed within an area that has very severe weather conditions.

Fourth, identification of critical habitat areas.

And we would add that those areas need to be mapped and clearly identified in a central computer mapping system so that if there is a spill, they can be responded to and those identi- -- those areas protected to the extent possible.

And fifth, provision for local government revenuesharing. As was mentioned earlier, in this particular lease
sale, Kodiak would see no economic benefits as a result of the
sale unless there is some provision for revenue-sharing as a
result of the sale. And so the local governments believe
that's a crucial aspect of -- that should be in place prior to
the lease sale going forward so that those who potentially

experience risk as a result of a lease sale are those that may actually see some gain or some benefit as a result of the sale as well.

Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Claire Holland?

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. CLAIRE HOLLAND

My name is Claire Holland, C-l-a-i-r-e H-o-l-l-a-n-d. My address is Star Route, Box 3800-B, and that's in Kodiak. And tonight I'm speaking for myself, and I just have a couple of quick comments.

I think that people of this region and the wildlife that inhabit both the marine and the upland habitats here rely completely on a clean and healthy environment. And I don't believe we have created accident-proof procedures for extracting and transporting oil in a marine environment, any marine environment and much less one as harsh as the one we live in here.

So I'm here to submit my opposition to Lease Sale 149 for your record. Thanks for being here.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Dick, do you have any more?

MR. ROBERTS: I don't back here.

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

MR. BROCK: Is there anybody else that would like to testify?

(Pause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. OLIVER HOLM

My name is Oliver Holm. That's O-l-i-v-e-r H-o-l-m, at Box 36 -- 3865, Kodiak.

My family makes its livelihood from the waters around Shelikof Straits, Kodiak Island. Shelikof Straits is an important spawning ground for cod, spawning ground for pollock and herring, and we have salmon and halibut and other fishery resources here. Kodiak Island is down current from this proposed oil production.

I could feel more comfortable with this proposed sale if the oil industry had made some serious effort to clean up spills. Since the 1989 spill, responsibility has been limited to Prince William Sound for the Alyeska carriers even though it's a proven fact that the oil spilled in the Sound will end up around Kodiak Island. I ran through many miles of spilled oil in the west side of Kodiak in 1989, as much as 40 miles in one trip in mid-May. It was not a very pretty sight.

We are still suffering damages from the spill that has not yet been compensated -- we have not yet been compensated for. We lost most of the 1989 herring year class. We lost most of our chum returns on the heavily oiled north mainland area around Hallo Bay. We have suffered a severe reduc-

tion on even-year pink production since the spill. These young pink salmon went to sea in 1989 when the oil was thickest around Kodiak Island. In addition, we were having a severe reduction in 1994/'95 sockeye production at Ikolik, Karluk, and Akalura due to over-escapement in 1989 because we couldn't fish in waters contaminated with oil.

I don't think the EIS or the oil industry can protect our livelihood from the effects of spilled oil. I think it is much safer to develop oil resources that are situated on shore. I am opposed to this sale. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Anyone else?

(Pause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. MIKE PATITUCCI

My name is Mike Patitucci. That's P-a-t-i-t-u-c-c-i, P.O. Box 1511, Kodiak, Alaska.

I've been fishing around Kodiak Island now for 19 years, and I love salmon fishing more than anything. In the year of the oil spill, I didn't get one of these great charters that the boys that are out there now with the big boats that I'm competing with. I just sat on the beach and hoped that there was a chance I could go. And it never happened.

I'll just tell you right now, gentlemen, the Shelikof is the nastiest place you'd ever want to be. It eats you up.

### (Laughter)

I mean, I get scared out there where you're talking about selling this lease to when it's flat calm. The tides from Cook Inlet are so big, and they come down and they hit the other tides, they just swirl. I mean, it just looks like -- and when it's blowing, it's like really bad.

I mean, if you have any idea, the -- Sitko 7 (ph) had a test rig out there in 1983. I mean, they had terrible problems. I know they must have because we found one of their big anchor buoys up on Black Cape. It was a brand new beautiful buoy. I mean, it must have been really smokin' to break that baby loose.

I'm just going to tell you, gentlemen, it'd be totally irresponsible to put a rig out there 'cause it's the worst -- it's the -- probably the second worst straits in the world. And that's about all I had to say, gentlemen.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. MARIAH OFFER

My name is Mariah Offer. That's M-a-r-i-a-h
O-f-f-e-r, P.O. Box 2264, Kodiak. I'm here tonight representing myself as a citizen. I didn't come all that prepared, but
I have a few things that I'd like to say.

I left the island a couple years ago not long after the Exxon Valdez oil spill and only recently returned. A lot

of the reasons why I left the island were due to the oil spill. For some of the reasons that Mary Jacobs gave, where it's harder for crew members to make a living since the spill for a lot of different reasons. But I came back to Kodiak because I love the island, and I love the people, and I love the wildlife.

I'd just like to say a little bit about the merchant marine industry, especially as it relates to the oil industry. I've been working in tugboats the last couple of years, and I think we've all seen some increase in regulations as it regards to vessels. The Coast Guard has made some new regulations. But there's also a lot of other factors that are involved.

And one is the way that the companies operate on the profit motive. We saw this in '89 during the oil spill, and I don't think things have really changed. Another thing is the way contracts are handed out.

About a year or two ago, there was an incident in Cook Inlet with a company that we call "Brand X." One of the companies maybe that underbid one of the more experienced tugboat outfits around. Like Brian said, Foss is real experienced in Cook Inlet. They underbid one of the companies that are familiar and equipped to deal with waters in Alaska, crew members that have worked in Alaskan waters, know about the cold, know about the ice. A company from a more warmer area that doesn't have ice got the contract.

2.2

And the mate who was on duty, who was on watch at the time, left the wheel, and the tug -- the supply vessel that I'm referring to drifted into an oil rig, hit one of the legs of the oil rig in Cook Inlet, and almost hit the drill pipe. This would have caused a serious accident.

So the point I'm making here are (sic) there are still a lot of things that go on in the industry that go beyond regulations. Everybody is trying to save money and underbid each other.

So I'm also aware of the conditions, especially in the winter, as a lot of the more experienced mariners have talked about. I'd also like to agree with everything they've said. And I've helped dock barges, fuel barges, in Nikiski. Twice I had to leave this summer with about two minutes' notice. We had to take all our lines off and leave just because of the way the wind shifted and the tide -- incoming tide caused us to leave. And we had a fuel barge that holds three million gallons of fuel. So -- and that's in the summertime. In the wintertime, there's problems with ice. That has created a lot of problems with vessels in the area.

So I'd just like to say I appreciate your time and also the time of all the other people that have voiced their opinions.

Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

## (Applause)

(Pause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CHUCK MCWETHY

I'm Chuck McWethy, M-c-W-e-t-h-y, Box 3504, Kodiak.

And I'm here as a commercial fisherman and somebody trying to raise a family in this town.

I've been -- had my own boat for 12 years, and I fish a lot in the Shelikof. And you've heard how nasty it gets, and we're down current of everything that happens in the Cook Inlet. They flush the toilet, and we get it. And I just don't -- I don't think, in our position, that that -- that I oppose this lease sale. It shouldn't be happening.

We've talked about what happened at Ikolik. I've fished salmon quite a few years, and I'm suffering more now from Exxon in '89 when I didn't fish -- I'm suffering more now, the last two years when I've fished in Ikolik than I ever did during that oil spill. We got a little bit out of it, but we've destroyed a river system. It's going to take -- it could take 20 or 30 years to bring that system back. And it's really a special system.

And as far as the social impact, it devastated our family in '89. Just the thought that that threat is hanging over us, that there's a -- the reason we've got volcanoes out there in the Shelikof, it's called a subduction zone. You've got mountains out there, and we've got a plate diving under it.

That creates a lot of, lot of earthquakes. And you guys are familiar with those. You -- I'm sure you gentlemen are from Alaska.

Right along the Shelikof, that line of volcanoes, they're there because there's a plate diving down, and that's -- there's two plates converging. If they pipe that oil to shore, it's going to break. There is going to be an earthquake, and it's going to slip on the bottom of the ocean, and they're going to bust pipes up. And if it don't do that, then a volcano's going to dump ash on the situation. And it's not a logical place to be poking holes in the ocean floor.

Anything that happens up there we pay for, and we pay for it dearly, with our hearts and souls. This island's a real pristine environment, and I really hope that you guys do everything in your power to stop them from drilling out there. Thank you.

MR. BROCK: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BROCK: Anyone else?

(Pause)

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. SUSAN EMERSON

My name is Susan Emerson, S-u-s-a-n E-m-e-r-s-o-n.

And I setnet on the west side of Kodiak Island many years ago,
and I would like to say that I would hate to see any oil ruin
the natural resources of our island. Thank you.

1 MR. BROCK: Thank you. 2 (Applause) Yes, sir. 3 MR. BROCK: (Inaudible comment, laughter) 4 5 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. DANNY STIHL 6 My name's Danny Stihl. It's S-t-i-h-l. And I repre-7 sent myself, hopefully my little family there. 8 I come very unprepared. I do not know the details of 9 this lease sale. I do not know what's playint (sic). And I 10 don't think I do need to know because all I need to know is 11 that there is a risk factor involved, that there is the proba-12 bility and possibility of an accident. And I don't think this 13 island, nor us, deserves to be spoiled a second time. 14 I think Shelikof is the wrong place, and this is not 15 the time for it. And I think I just would like to leave it 16 As long as there is any risk factor involved, I'm 17 opposed to this. And I hope you also take note is that, so 18 far, nobody's been for this proposal. Thank you. 19 MR. BROCK: Thank you. 20 (Applause) 21 MR. BROCK: Anyone else? 22 (Pause) 23 FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: She wants to come, 24 too.

Very good. Can we count this as two

MR. BROCK:

people?

2

1

#### (Laughter)

3

# 4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MS. ISA WIRZ

Okay. I'm the wife of the man who just talked. Well, my name is Isa Wirz, I-s-a, last name, W-i-r-z. And I am talking for myself and for this little one. Her name is And I'm talking not just for her, but this island has many, many kids like her, and we just don't want to see another oil spill like in '89 and have all the kids and all the fishing families having to go through the same traumatic experience.

And I want -- I really enjoy the environment and the nature here. That's why we moved from crowded, polluted Europe to Alaska. And I want her to enjoy the same thing that I can enjoy now, and all the other kids, too, just a clean environ-And if she ever wants to make a living with fishing, who I want her to have the chance, too, like I had the chance when I got here. Thank you.

> MR. BROCK: Thank you.

> > (Applause)

MR. BROCK: Anyone else?

(No audible response)

MR. BROCK: It's 8:25 -- well, about 8:28. there's nobody else -- I don't want to cut anybody off that might want to testify. But if not, we'll close the hearing. Ι want to extend my appreciation to all of you that came. Ι

really enjoy seeing the youth of the community getting involved in an important issue like this. I think that's very important, and that shows that they're taking an interest in what's going on. And I really -- I think that's great.

And I do want you to know that your comments will be read by every individual that helped prepare this EIS. We -- the next step, just to clarify where we go from here, we -- the decision has not been made whether we'll even prepare a final EIS, but if the decision is made to prepare the final EIS, we will start on that after the comments are all in on April the 19th. We will look at all the people that were involved in writing the EIS. We'll look at all the comments. We will either change the EIS appropriately, or we will respond to the comment as to what happened to that comment.

That will come out in the final EIS, which is due out about a year from now. And then the decision, which is a Secretarial decision, the Secretary of the Interior, to determine whether or not he will proceed with the sale, will be made, and the sale is scheduled about the early summer 1996. But let me emphasize that no decision has been made at this point. The first decision even whether to prepare a final EIS has not been made, and it's definitely that there's -- no decision has been made on the sale itself.

So I want to extend our appreciation and thank you for coming, and you have been heard. We are closed.

1	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-entitl	ed
2	matter were concluded at 8:30 p.m.)	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2

1

PUBLIC TESTIMONY	PAGE
Kristin Stahl-Johnson	7
Jane Eisemann	14
Written Mostinony of Others Bond Into the Bonned	
By Ms. Eisemann:	
Matt Lohr (ph)	14
Chris Arndt	15
Jeremy Votz (ph)	16
Mark Woitell (ph)	17
Aaron Star (ph)	18
Jodi Holfort (ph)	19
Brian Johnson	20
Debra Nielsen	24
Brian Large	25
Stacy Studebaker	26
Mike Sirofchuck	28
Peter Allan	30
Rose Cobis	34
Mary Jacobs	35
Bruce Short	39
Linda Freed	39
Claire Holland	44
Oliver Holm	45
	Kristin Stahl-Johnson Jane Eisemann  Written Testimony of Others Read Into the Record By Ms. Eisemann:  Matt Lohr (ph) Chris Arndt Jeremy Votz (ph) Mark Woitell (ph) Aaron Star (ph) Jodi Holfort (ph) Brian Johnson Debra Nielsen Brian Large Stacy Studebaker Mike Sirofchuck Peter Allan Rose Cobis Mary Jacobs Bruce Short Linda Freed Claire Holland

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

3	PUBLIC TESTIMONY																			PAGE
4	Mike Patitucci			•	•				•			•		•	•	•	•	•		46
5	Mariah Offer	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	47
6	Chuck McWethy	•		•	•	•		•	•	•		•		•		•	•		•	50
7	Susan Emerson			•	•	•		•	•		•	•					•			51
8	Danny Stihl .	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•	•				•	•	52
9	Isa Wirz																			53

#### CERTIFICATION

STATE OF ALASKA )

THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT )

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)

# I, CINDY S. CARL, do hereby certify:

- (1) That the foregoing pages contain a full, true, and correct transcript of proceedings in the above-entitled matter, transcribed by me, or at my direction and supervision, to the best of my knowledge and ability.
- (2) That I have been certified for transcript services by the United States Courts.
- (3) That I was certified for transcript services by the Alaska Court System prior to January 1, 1993.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED:

BY: Cendy S. Carl

Certified Court Reporter

DATE: 3/26/95

